

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
FOREWORD	9
THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS . . .	12
THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK'S ADDRESS .	26
I. THE ETERNAL SPIRIT :	
(a) IN NATURE—	
(i) Dr. Adams (the late) . . .	35
(ii) Rev. J. C. Hardwick . . .	19
(b) IN THE BIBLE—	
(i) Rev. Professor Simpson . . .	61
(ii) Rev. Professor McNeile . . .	76
(iii) Rev. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns . .	87
(c) IN THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH—	
(i) Rev Canon Newsom . . .	99
(ii) Rev Professor Barry . . .	112
II. THE WAY OF THE SPIRIT .	
(a) IN THE INDIVIDUAL—	
(i) Dr William Brown . . .	127
(ii) Miss Evelyn Underhill . . .	142
(b) IN THE COMMUNITY—	
(i) Mrs Creighton . . .	152
(ii) The Bishop of Manchester . .	165

III PREPARING HIS WAY .

(a) BY THE SERVICE OF PHYSICAL
WELFARE—

(i) Dr W E Henderson . . . 179

(ii) Captain R L Reiss . . . 192

(b) BY THE EXPRESSION OF BEAUTY—

(i) Rev Professor Percy Dearmer. . . 204

(ii) Sir W. H. Hadow . . . 217

(c) BY MENTAL DEVELOPMENT—

(i) Mr R A Raven . . . 242

(ii) Rev Canon Gamble . . . 263

(d) BY DEVOTIONAL SERVICE—

(i) The Bishop of Ripon . . . 275

(ii) Rev Canon R G Parsons . . . 287

IV THE SPIRIT AND EVANGELISM

(i) Rev Canon Raven . . . 297

(ii) Rev Canon Garfield Williams . . . 308

FOREWORD.

By way of preface to this collection of the Papers read at the Southport Church Congress, I venture to quote an introduction to the scheme of subjects which was sent out in December 1925 to those whom we had invited to read or speak. It is as follows :—

“The programme falls into four closely related sections, and aims as a whole at surveying, examining, applying, and inviting response to the Church’s faith in the Holy Spirit. We have been repeatedly warned alike by Christian Scholars and by Christian Workers that our understanding of the Holy Spirit is inadequate, and our consecration to Him often weak and unreal, and it is hoped that by devoting the whole time of the Congress to His service, we may be led to clearer vision and more manifest power.

“The First Three Sessions will deal with our heritage—the Eternal Spirit as revealed in Nature, in the Bible, and in Christian doctrine and institutions. First we would see the Spirit as the “giver of life”; as operative in the process of Creation, bringing order and development out of chaos; as manifested in the progress of life towards the apprehension of God, being Himself the source of all effort towards perfection. Then we would trace man’s perception of this through the increasing witness of the Old Testament, and in the culminating revelation of the Son of God. Finally we would trace the effects of this supreme experience as it is defined and expressed in the thought and life of the Church. It is important that readers of papers and speakers should keep their task as interpreters of the Spirit clearly in view,

avoiding general treatment whether of the problems of 'Religion and Science,' or of the details of technical theology. This section of the programme should convince us of the reality and universal significance of Him whom we worship, as Lord and Life-Giver.

"The Second Section deals with a more detailed examination of the Spirit's revelation of Himself in the individual and in the fellowship. We want to consider by what avenues the Spirit normally influences us; and if we are to do so, we must begin by a study of psychology in relation to spiritual experience, and of mysticism as communion with the Spirit. This will lead up to the vexed problem of the group-consciousness or 'over-soul,' of the spiritual capacity of fellowship, and of love, joy and peace as the fruit and evidence of the Spirit. Speakers are asked to treat the subjects rather scientifically than emotionally, with a view to investigation and exposition rather than to exhortation; to show us as far as they can how the Spirit 'makes contact' with mankind, and under what conditions and in what circumstances His presence may be realized.

"The Third Section deals with some aspects of our task in preparing ourselves to receive His influence. It is divided into four headings corresponding to the physical, the aesthetic, the intellectual and (in the narrower sense) the religious sides of our nature. In all of these evidently the Spirit operates: in all of them therefore we are called to do our share in co-operating with Him. Plainly the topics to be treated are selected and illustrative; they do not cover the whole ground. Speakers are asked to bear this in mind, and in treating of any particular topic to show how this side of our activity can be so ordered as to reveal the presence and serve the ends of the Spirit. They should remember the rest of the programme,

and the place which their speech will take in the whole. Subject to this, the more 'practical' they can be, the better.

"Finally the programme concludes with a section which is intended both to summarise the results of our enquiry, and to point the way to a fuller realization of the Mission of the Spirit, to give a wide vision of the scope of évangélism, and to enable us to dedicate ourselves to the fulfilment of the Spirit's purpose—the embodiment of mankind into an organism in which every member in all its activities is animated and inspired by His life."

For us in the Liverpool Diocese the Congress was specially marked by a Diocesan preparation, undertaken by groups of clergy, and shared later on by lay study circles. These preliminaries and the Congress itself are described in Canon Raven's book (*The Eternal Spirit*, Hodder & Stoughton, 2/6.)

I think it may be claimed that the course of thought we planned and followed suggests a further task for Christian thinkers and writers, namely to bring into popular Theology a clearer and more practical conception of "the Power that worketh in us." I will only add that for us the Congress has been something more than an intellectual enquiry. From the first we set before ourselves the ambition for a more abundant share, not of understandings only but also of power. And many of us were conscious in the concluding Service of an experience which revealed to us new possibilities of human consecration by the offering of man's highest capacities and best work for contact with the Divine Inspirer of all good life.

Dec. 1926.

ALBERT LIVERPOOL.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

WE have invited you to join us in a task which we believe to be specially incumbent on Christians of to-day, and we are very grateful for the help which Readers and Speakers, and also listeners, are going to give us. The task is to think out that mode of the Divine activity which we describe to ourselves as the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and minds of men, to discern the signs, and to contemplate boldly, yet humbly, the fact of His Presence there, to study the conditions He demands in order that His indwelling may have a full and free effect, and to discover how we may assist, in so far as it lies in our power, to produce those conditions, how, in other words, we may prepare His way.

PROGRESSIVE REVELATION.

As an introduction to this task, I propose to offer you a brief survey of the long, slow process by which mankind has already been growing in the knowledge of God. We have not yet fully achieved it. All has been revealed in Jesus Christ, but all has not yet been received. Let us then first consider the portions and the manners of that knowledge which appear to have been received and realized, and then take thought of that further portion which waits to be worked into human experience.

GOD ABOVE MAN.

There are two groups of ideas about God which mankind has to some extent succeeded in assimilating.

They have done so in what, for the purpose of our study, we may represent to ourselves as two separate though not altogether successive stages. In the first stage, broadly speaking, they had to learn the lesson of the majesty and power of God. They saw Him reigning supreme, first in the tribe, then in the nation, then in all the earth. Now they were helped to learn this lesson by the analogy of government as they knew government. Theirs were the days of autocracy. To them it was natural that one man should have supreme power over groups or masses of his fellow men. A patriarch or king had full control over the lives of his family or his subjects. Their fate was in his hands. His slightest wish must be obeyed. In theory he could act exactly as he pleased. It was theirs to submit, or to rebel.

Thus, when they tried to imagine the Lord of all the World they tended to think of Him like that, like one of their own potentates, infinitely greater, but possessing the same arbitrary power, put forth without strain, without suffering. There He sat (so they thought at first) serene, untroubled, safe from the labours and miseries of the world below.

Now it is clear that this conception of infinite power, of majesty remote and holiness unapproachable, helped out as it was by the analogy of human absolutism, does lie at the root of that sense of the *mysterium tremendum* which is indispensable in all true thought of God. Yet the analogy of itself and uncorrected would have led them wrong. Even now of itself and unsupplemented it leads us wrong. There is familiar language about God which still suggests to the unthinking an omnipotent despot, imposing His authority from above, overwhelming opposition, dominant, irresponsible, forcing His enemies to submit when he chooses, or can be roused to exercise His power. When that conception of God stands by

itself, does it not account for many of the difficulties and confusions of popular theology? Men still ask "If your God is omnipotent why did He not stop the War, or the Coal Strike?"

GOD WITH MAN.

But even among the men of old time the analogy was not uncorrected. Side by side with the revelation of God's power ran the revealing of His Love. Prophets spoke of God the husband, wedded to his people, of God the Father, yearning for His children's love. Psalmists sang of God the Shepherd and the Friend. There was growing a conviction of another aspect of the manifold character of God, the aspect of a nearer Presence. Jesus took hold of it, and with startling boldness transferred to it the whole emphasis of His teaching. Mankind has learnt that God is Power; now it must learn that He is Love (Love is nearer than power), and all that this involves for Him and for their vision of Him.

Again we see a relation with human politics. He points it Himself. "Jesus called them to him and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them: and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you; but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all."

Thus through His disciples He spoke to the rulers of men, and not in vain. Already our great ones are not they that can impose their wills upon the greatest number, but they that bear the heaviest burdens because they serve. By our own experience we have learnt that leadership is harder far than mastership.

and many there have been and are whose ministry has taught them a truer vision of the God who deigns to serve. So, too, has the discovery of God the Son, working with His children and suffering their pains, reacted on human government and made of it a nobler thing.

Such are the two groups of ideas about God which mankind has in some degree appropriated. And we at the end of these days have fused them into one. To us God is Almighty not because He does at any moment whatsoever pleases Him, but because He can and does endure to the utmost for the men He loves, and waits with unconquerable patience for their response. God the Father above us, the embodiment and source of power, reigning, ordering, disposing, and God the Son among us, leading, and therefore labouring and suffering, these Two are One. In the very centre of the Godhead there is service side by side with Majesty.

GOD WITHIN MAN

But is that enough? We know already, our creed teaches us, that it is not "God above" and "God among" are still outside mankind. Yet in plain language it is written: "If we love one another God dwelleth in us," and "Ye are the temple of the living God," and "the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." The knowledge of the first two Persons of the Trinity leads to the after knowledge of the Third. From the Father and the Son proceeds the Holy Spirit, God within us. It remains for us to discern Him there. We have seen how one side and another of God's relationship to men was interpreted to them in terms of earthly rulership. Is there for us also an analogy from political and social life by which we can explain

to ourselves another side of His manifold activity?

In our day a third type of human government has established itself, and is spreading over all the world. We are witnesses and sharers of a new ruling power. It must, of course, be admitted that Democracy is still on its trial. There are some who deny that power and responsibility can in any real sense be diffused throughout a multitude. Yet we are bound to proceed upon the theory that they can. As we do so, may we not be intended to learn from that theory a lesson which will strengthen our belief that the Eternal Spirit may there also be recognized? There are, moreover, other channels in abundance open now to His activity. Life, sharing with other lives a larger life, distinct from each and yet absorbing all; that is a commonplace in these days of movements and conferences, of team work in thought and action, and of great scale enterprises for all manner of purposes which depend for their success upon a common inspiration towards a common loyalty. All down the history of man's development we can watch the individual and his interests emerging from the interest of the mass. At every successive stage of that development he counts for more, but only on the condition that his separate life is consciously and willingly limited and even merged in fellowship, so that in the end "he that loseth his life shall save it." If that be God's end for us, then are we not in these days called to a special study of the impulse that strives in masses and in individuals towards that end?

mankind struggling upwards, out of the chaos of savagery into the primitive beginnings of co operative order. Each step is attempted against overwhelming odds, and each brings new perils. Man is always essaying the seemingly impossible, and always, through crisis after crisis, and with lapse after lapse, he achieves it. What is it that in him strives unrecognized towards an end not yet comprehended even in his hope? It is the Eternal Spirit, with infinite patience lifting him towards God's hope. We would watch mankind striving through philosophy and science to seek truth through creative art to express beauty, through love to practise goodness. Man may not always refer these impulses to their source in the living perfection of goodness, beauty, and truth which is God. Yet all the time it is the same Spirit which in every attainment, however imperfect, enables him. We watch mankind being prepared by the discipline of patient search for larger capacity to receive the Spirit, and clearer consciousness of His Presence, until the day when out of one perfect human life wherein the Divine Life was incarnate, the Spirit of God proceeded to strengthen Himself in the lives of all who in the power of Christ could open surrender, consecrate themselves to Him. After Pentecost we watch a growing multitude of men fully aware not only of God ruling above them not only of God labouring and suffering among them, but also of God dwelling, striving and proving Himself within them, God fully revealed as Love, and where can love be but within? In them we see the beginnings of a society charged with a mission to provide for the Spirit of Christ a lasting earthly dwelling place where He may work in full co operation with all its members and whence He may continually reveal Himself to all mankind.

THE SPIRIT AND EVANGELISM. A NEW APPEAL.

At this point I would turn your attention to a practical outcome of the course of thought we are going to suggest to you, and ask you to consider afresh the task laid upon the Church of bearing witness to the Spirit so revealed in Christ. I am thinking especially of the *first* presentation of the truth to the ignorant, the indifferent, the uninterested. How shall we open to them a *first* approach to Christ, and help them to a *first* contact with His Spirit? We have inherited a method, an apparatus, a technique of Evangelism appropriate enough to the last century, but, as I would venture to suggest, inadequate now, and that in two respects.

In the first place it assumed the fear of Hell. I do not mean that the great mission preachers of old always deliberately relied on the emotion of terror or the motive of self-interest. Nevertheless, it seems to me clear that their appeal did awaken in their hearers a sense of fear. How should it be otherwise at a time when everybody took it for granted that an eternity of physical suffering was a possible destiny of all created beings and the probable fate of many? For us the old symbol of the eternal fire is gone. We do not forget, let us not allow it to be forgotten, that the reality behind it remains; God's stern unbending hatred of evil, and the immutable law that he who sins must suffer or, what is worse, bring suffering on others. To make that discovery about our sins would be hell enough for many of us. You will say that it takes most men a long time to make it. I agree, and that is why I would suggest the question whether we do well to hold to the tradition of presenting the idea of sin and judgment as a first appeal. Watch our Lord Himself at work drawing

all men unto Him. He did not begin by denouncing their sinfulness, or warning them of the punishment that awaited them if they remained in it. It was not till Peter had lived and worked with Him for some time that he said "Depart from me for I am a sinful man." It was not till Zacchæus had already been drawn to One who believed in him that he realized what his life had been like. Jesus began by seeing and shewing that He saw the goodness in every one He met, that He trusted it, that He needed it. The rest they would discover for themselves. That gives us our warrant to do likewise. I would not deny that there are thousands who will yet be drawn to the Saviour mainly by the conviction of hopeless entanglement with which they are themselves powerless to deal. But others there are, more numerous, I think, who are first drawn to Him when they see that there is goodness also in them and in their fellow men, that God desires to use it for their happiness and for the work of His kingdom, that He trusts them, and that where they have failed it is because they have not responded to that trust. The whole world was involved in that failure when the Son of God came and they drove Him out. But that was not the end. He goes on trusting the human race, and every member of the same, that is our sure and certain hope. Till God despairs of us we need not despair of ourselves or of each other. Bad as we know ourselves to be we are still of use to Him. He needs us for a work in His world which He desires to share with us, which, without our help, He cannot accomplish. For that purpose He is eager through His Spirit to make contact with the best in men, the best in every man, which is His and He made it.

When a man has heard that call he can surely be left to develop a sense of sin for himself. The more

he works with God the keener grows his consciousness of all within him which stains and spoils, and lets and hinders. But shew him *first* that salvation is positive, not negative. Call him *to* something rather than *away from* something, and make him sure that God's concern with him is not restricted to his sins.

THE SPIRIT AND GOODNESS, TRUTH, BEAUTY.

That leads me to the second fresh direction of evangelistic work which I would offer to your consideration. The typical evangelist of the past in his desire to awaken first a sense of sin, has tended to present a vision of God, narrowed and incomplete. He leaves on men's minds the impression that the work of God in this world is confined to the moral sphere. Now Christ came into the world to save sinners, and no effort deserves the name of Evangelism which fails to proclaim that fact. But it is not always remembered that He came for another purpose also, as He Himself asserts, namely, to reveal the Father, to shew what God is like. He has laid it on us to continue that revelation, to shew God as He is, as we see Him in Christ. But have we done it? My belief is that evangelistic work has often failed because we have talked of salvation to men who do not know the God who saves. I plead, therefore, for a fuller witness of the Church to the world for God. Let us shew the whole range of His work through the Spirit on this earth, moving within men's souls towards the perfections of truth and beauty and goodness which are from eternity in Himself. Let us say to men who feel any kind of impulse urging them towards these ideals, to administrators, to scientists, to philosophers, to artists, to philanthropists, let us say,

"This power that stirs within you, that bids you achieve, yet suffers you not to be content with achievement, ever urging you from good work to better, this is the Spirit of God. You acknowledge the stimulus, calling it by other names. But you can neither understand, nor possess or be possessed by it, until you identify it with its source. It is a personal source. How otherwise could it have vital contact with your own persons? Will you not seek the whole knowledge of Him who has thus revealed Himself to you in part? Will you not recognize your work as part of His?"

Likewise, I would say to all men, "You have within you, and you can see in other men around you, impulses towards goodness. Sometimes you can see them carried into action, sometimes before that happens they are stifled by other impulses you also share. But the goodness is there. How do you account for it? You may call it a sense of duty or a constraint of love; but that does not explain where it comes from. Why not face the fact that it proceeds from God? Wherever you see goodness asserting itself you see the Spirit at work. Whenever you lend your own self to any such an impulse, as you often do, you are making contact for the moment with the same Spirit. He is waiting to strengthen and make permanent that contact in us all. Then will God's goodness, already a vital force in the world, become an all-conquering power."

And in particular to teachers, and to all who have contact with young people, I would say: "Be at pains to discern the nascent goodness in them, and to build on it. It is better for you and for them that you should even exaggerate the signs, however dim, of good impulse in them, than that you should grow to be interested mainly in their faults." Listen to Paracelsus in Browning's poem telling us how,

as a teacher, he failed, "and why?" he says—

"In my own heart love had not been made wise
To trace love's faint beginnings in mankind,
To know even hate is but a mask of love's,
To see a good in evil, and a hope
In ill success—to sympathise, be proud
Of their half reasons faint aspirations dim
Struggles for truth their poorest fallacies,
Their prejudice and fears and cares and doubts,
All with a touch of nobleness, despite
Their error, upward tending all though weak,
Like plants in mines which never saw the sun,
But dream of him, and guess where he may be,
And do their best to climb and get to him—
All this I knew not, and I failed."

DANGERS

At this point it is well frankly to recognize that such an introduction to religious truth as I have sketched opens the way to certain dangers. If we begin by an emphasis on the good in man rather than the evil, on God's need of man rather than man's need of God, are we not fostering a spirit of pride and self sufficiency? So it would be if we represented to a man his goodness as something of his own. Look at the matter through an experience which most of us can recall. Here and there a friend has touched your life, not by words only, but rather by something you have seen in him which has helped to fill out your spiritual vision of God in Christ. One day perhaps you tell him, or he finds out otherwise, what you imagine he has done for you, or shewn to you. At first being a humble person (as are all who help us most) he is puzzled and even afraid. He thought he *knew* himself, but not like that. Is he an impostor after all? No. What he shewed was not his own. It was the power of God, or to use a more personal and, therefore, a truer

description, it was the Spirit of God shining out through him. It does not make a man proud to recognize that he is using what he does not possess, provided that he refers it to its source. Indeed, I find that this recognition is one spiritual road to penitence and humility and an ever closer dependence on the source so recognized.

It may be urged that the language I have used, and with it much of our enquiry itself, tends to a many-sided peril called "Pantheism." To this I would reply that what keeps men safe from all such vague and unbalanced conceptions of Divine omnipresence is the discipline of corporate Worship, in which our spirits are drawn in awe and reverence to a Presence outside and a Power beyond ourselves. So long as we hold and continually refresh our vision of God above and God among us, we need not fear to look for Him where St. Paul tells us that He may be found; not "above all" and "through all" only, but also "in all."

Again, we should not forget that the call to co-operate with God, to be fellow-workers with Him, may easily lead to the substitution of "*doing good*" for "*being good*" as the governing aim of life. We of the West are peculiarly liable to this danger, with our practical minds, our instinctive urge to "get busy," our gospel of work. It lies in wait for us whatever our first stimulus to faith has been, but we have safeguards if we will use them. One is meditation. Here we have something to learn from the East, from the hours and even days of self-devoted contemplation by which the best of the Brahmins lose themselves, and find what they call "God-consciousness." We cannot pay that price, nor is it asked of us. But we can learn to meditate, quietly to fix the mind upon some Christ-revealing scene or experience or word. It is certain that whoever does

so, however imperfectly, will be left with a deep but not a hopeless discontent with self. We have, moreover, in the Sacrament our own means of drawing near, that we may be made like Him, by submission, but not by suppression, of ourselves. The life so received through His Body and Blood is an active life for the doing of His Will, but it is also a growing life towards His perfection.

HOPES

As we look out upon the world, it is easy enough to read the signs of restlessness, confusion, and something like despair. But other signs are visible, too, to those who have eyes to see. Can we not feel a new expectancy? It was abundantly revealed to us among non-Christian people in the survey of the Four Reports. Are we not conscious of the same Spirit moving in our own half-Christian country? In many places and in divers manners men are turning shyly to a new hope, faint as yet and undefined. Can we meet them on their own ground?

A few months ago a group of Labour men came to some representatives of the movement known as Copec, and said in effect this: "We of the Labour Movement have our experience of fellowship and of inspiration through fellowship, and you of the Churches have yours. Some of us think that *yours* is a larger, a completer experience, more reasoned, more authentic than ours. It may be that yours includes and explains ours, that the fellowship of the Church is after all, in theory at any rate, the essential and ideal fellowship of men. Can you make this clear to us? Can you put for us *our* experience in terms of yours?"

You see they were in search of a philosophy of

their experience and their ideals. It ought to be easy enough to supply and to develop. In fact, it was found more difficult than was expected. And the reason was mainly this, that in the working theology of the ordinary Christian the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is incomplete.

As we advance to its completion, I believe we shall be given a fresh insight into the mind of God. Lifting our eyes from earth, where at best things are only painfully becoming, to the heavenly places where in full reality they are, let us see this fact of God in man fulfilled in the desire of God Himself. To reign supreme is not enough for Him. To lead the host of His soldiers and servants is not enough for Him. Not only does God who made them claim them for His own. Not only does Christ Who died for them draw them to Himself, but also God desires them for His dwelling place. Into them He has breathed His breath of life, and He waits to live a more abundant life in them when they shall live to Him. He cannot be satisfied until in Power and in Love He is alive and active in the whole mass of mankind. And we cannot see Him as He is, until with the eye of faith and hope we see Him there.

ADDRESS BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
(Right Hon and Most Rev C G LANG, D D)

I HAVE an instinct that you will all agree with me that any words spoken after the Address to which we have listened must needs be superfluous, may even be felt to be an intrusion. The function of the President's Address is to give tone, direction and stimulus to the Congress. For that reason I am sure it ought to stand by itself. The Address to which we have just listened from the President, if I may say so in his presence, admirably fulfils that function. He has put old truths before us in a new aspect. He has brought new aspects of truth before us which may well demand our thought and prayers. He has given the Church a real stimulus to fresh thinking and fresh action. For that very reason, in my own belief, his Address ought to have been left to make its own impression. I told the Bishop so beforehand and what I said to him some weeks ago I feel more strongly now, but he urged that what is before you in the programme should be fulfilled. I was very reluctant to be the first to make a breach in a programme so carefully and thoughtfully prepared and, therefore, against my better judgment I consented to obey. But I stipulated that I should adhere to the programme as it was first put before me and that what I said should be regarded not as another Address but simply as a speech, a word spoken as it were, from the body of the Congress and yet with whatever authority may belong to the office which I hold. All I wish to do in fulfilling the demand of the Bishop is to enforce and emphasize, so far as God gives me grace, the summons which through this Congress he makes to the Church. I would ask you, first, to consider the significance of

the subject which he has chosen for this Congress and which he has outlined with such freshness and force in his Address. It recalls the Church, in the midst of its labours and desires and perplexities, to the very essence of its life and the sole secret of its power. I think there can be no doubt—our conscience would convince us of it while he spoke to us—that the President is right in saying that there has been and is a singular lack of proportion between the thought which is given by Christian people to God above us, holy and transcendent, and to God among us in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the thought that is given to God within us in the Holy Spirit. The intellect is indeed inevitably and rightly baffled by the relationship with one another of what we call, with stumbling and feeble lips, the three Persons of the One God. Indeed, that very sentence reveals the pitiful inadequacy of any words as symbols of this tremendous mystery. But there is not the same bafflement in realizing our own relation to each of these Three Adorable Persons. It is in our prayer life that we reach the highest activity of our manhood. We move up the scale of reality to where there begins a new tendency to God and in the first contact of the finite with the infinite Spirit we reach nearest the purpose of God's creative love, we approach that return to God which is the meaning, the only intelligible meaning, of this wondrous unity. In that prayer life, when we approach God, we are in some dim but definite measure, capable of consciousness of the holy and all encompassing power, we are capable, in some real measure, of realizing, of having the consciousness of God drawing near to us and drawing us to Himself in the living Christ, Lord, Redeemer and Master. But it is just there, in that prayer life, that we ought to be conscious in an even more intimate and close manner of the Holy Spirit,

for He is not so much the object as the subject of our prayer, it is not so much we that pray to Him as He that prays with us. In the very impulse to pray He manifests His presence. He is God, seeking before He is sought. In the very first movements of prayer towards God, God the Holy Spirit is already present. I wonder how many of us are sometimes, as I am, almost appalled by the audacity of prayer. I kneel on my knees to say my prayers. What am I doing? Am I, a frail worm, a simple, ignorant creature at the best, but a speck in this vast universe, really at this moment in direct and personal converse with the ineffable majesty of God? Sometimes, when that question arises within us, it is a great thing to remember that there could not be so much as the faintest desire to reach towards God unless God Himself were already present in that feeble, stumbling, striving mind. God the Holy Spirit is the very breath of the soul which makes its slightest movement possible. Thus, on the one hand, it is no paradox to say that it is just because the Holy Spirit is so very near to us that we fail to see Him and, on the other hand, how much more full and free, hopeful and thankful, would our prayer life be if we were conscious that in its faintest stirring God the Holy Spirit was Himself moving within us, yearning to lead us in that return to God the Father through Christ the Eternal Son, which is the true purpose of our being. It is worth while for the humblest of us to think that our simplest prayer or meditation, if only reverent and sincere is itself part of the mighty life and movement of God. How much closer, then, would be our grasp of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, how much deeper our response to the love of God if we were all much more continually conscious of the fellowship of the Holy Ghost. Well if that is true of each individual among us, that our life would be infinitely

quickened and deepened and empowered if we had more conscious recollection of the presence within us of the Holy Spirit, it is even more true of the life of the whole Church, which is the Body where He dwells. He is there to teach and strengthen so that the Church, in every place and at all times, may bear its witness to the revelation and redemption brought to the world in Christ the Lord. The witness most needed and, therefore, most effective in our religion is the witness of living experience. It has been truly said that in these days the centre of gravity in religion has shifted from authority to experience. The witness which will bring Christ home to the life and conscience of our time is not primarily the creeds, however venerable, which it rehearses, or the religious rites, however beautiful, which it fulfils, or the practical work, however active and beneficent, which it does, but the living experience which, as a body, it exhibits. Is not that precisely what gave wonderful significance to the life and work of that great saint of God, the little, high hearted, loving St. Francis of Assisi whom to day the whole of Christendom remembers? And in that remembrance I would ask this Congress to take its share. He saved Christianity, the great historians told us, in the confusion and turmoil of the thirteenth century, and saved it by recovering for the Church the reality of the Christian experience. Into all the pomp and pageantry of medieval religion, already becoming somewhat distant from the reality of personal Christianity, he brought the one thing that keeps Christianity alive, the life of one who knew something of the joy of sacrifice with Christ, who went through the world as one who was at home in his Father's gifts, the lilies of the field and the fowls of the air, to whom it was natural to look upon every man he met as his brother because he lived, day by day, in the consciousness of God as his Father, and

it was by the witness of living experience that St Francis and his Order, in their first great days, saved the cause of Christianity. It is not otherwise, believe me, at this present time. That is why, some time ago, I ventured to say to the Church Congress at Sheffield that the Church must evangelize itself before it can undertake to evangelize the world. It must somehow recover, not among a few but as a great corporate possession, the reality, the vivid, intense, obvious reality of a living experience which the world will at once desire and discern to be given only through Christ. And yet, all the while, there is this divine, personal power longing and able to achieve that reality of experience. The first activity of the Church, and I take this to be the meaning of the President's summons, must be to stir up the gift of the Holy Ghost within us by deliberate and constant recollection and prayer, the channel through which He can come and make Christ live before the eyes of men in His Church. I ask you to remember this. It is a special thought in the President's Address, which I ask you to keep in mind, and if I may be permitted I may enlarge a little upon it here to-morrow morning. Let us remember that the same Holy Spirit is Himself, in His wider activity in the Spirit of Man, continually preparing the way for the witness which He empowers the Church to give. In the great movements of the world such as are presented to us now so impressively by the four great Reports in the movements of philosophy and science, literature and art, as the President has reminded us, in the efforts of social reform, in what we call the signs of the times, He is Himself at work, calling in the Spirit of Man for the witness which He empowers the Church to give. The President is entirely right in asking us to adapt our witness, our evangelism, in these days to these new and wider movements of

the Holy Spirit It must be plain to us all that the preparation of the spread of the Gospel of Christ must be entirely different in a multitude of people who have been largely educated, who are keen and alert and questioning and critical, from what it was when it stirred to remorse and repentance all the wild, rough, rude people who were thrown up by the great convulsion of the industrial revolution, and the Church must be quick to see and hear that summons of the Spirit in that new temper, tone and movement of mankind If it is wise to heed His calling and follow His summons we may trust His guidance One word more, which I think ought to be spoken If we, individually and as a Church, are thus to renew our possession of the Holy Spirit so to recover the reality and power of our religion, there is one thing needed We must learn to be still Only in quietness, in stillness, can we discern His mind and hear His voice and receive His power, only in silence can we catch the whisper of the still, small voice, if we are to be in the Spirit we must be in quiet and this one thing needful is, as we all know, the one thing most difficult in these days I need not labour the point In one aspect of it we have entirely failed as yet to adapt ourselves to the ever rapid increase of mechanical motion The haste and noise of that mechanical movement is infecting the soul The very Day of Rest, as we see in all the roads surrounding our great cities, is becoming a day of rush and the call of the Church to wait on the Holy Spirit involves that other thought that it must deliberately make ways of escape from this noise and haste, that it must take time to be still There is a word that comes to us which indicates the method—Retreat It is not a devotional writer but our leading physician, Lord Dawson, who has said it is true to day as ever that man needs periodically a desert place apart and all

that it implies You, my brothers of the clergy, are undergoing or suffering a dispensation of conferences There is a great sign of activity of mind and freshness of interest, yet if they are to bear any fruit they must be balanced by Retreats Times of talk must be balanced by times of silence I am tempted to indulge again in a figure of speech which came to me the other day when I was taken to a village fair and I saw the merry go round And I said to myself, in a moment There is the Church of England in conference—a great deal of stir, movement, excitement and exhilaration, leading nowhere, round and round and never arriving And there is great need that with all this talking there should be much more deliberation than there is—great spaces of silence It is not only for our clergy in these days, if we are really to wait on the Holy Spirit and recover His power, that we need these times of Retreat but for all our people They are just as much affected by the atmosphere of the times as we are In every class and every kind of place we must make means whereby they can be enabled in silence to realize the presence within them The Retreat House of the diocese, I hope, is already a familiar thing but, and this, I venture to say, is really one of the outcomes of the subject of this Conference, it must be far more widely used and must become a normal part of the Church life of all our people, and if this Congress is to take effect in the life of the Church it must be followed up by making these deliberate times of quiet possible and usual for all our people At least I would plead that in our worship in these days we should find more place than we do for purposeful silence, recollection and consciousness of the Spirit, which is never realized so fully as in the fellowship of silence At first it may seem strange, as so many of us are infected with the secular atmosphere, but it would be

a great thing if, in stated moments of our public worship, we bade our people be still so that in silence they could become aware of the presence and power of God within us, the Holy Ghost, and I am very sure that a Church that is able thus to retreat in quiet is a Church that will return to our common life in power

May I close with one word about this Congress, if it is not presumptuous I confess I am not an habitual Congress goer To speak the truth, I find the Church Congress is a diet to which my faculties of mental and spiritual digestion are not equal It is always a danger of Conference that people move about listening to continual talk It would be a special misfortune if this Congress, of all others, were to make that mistake, for its object is surely not merely to hear what this and that prominent Churchman has to say about the Holy Spirit, not even to gain fresh thoughts about the Holy Spirit, but to establish a new contact with the Holy Spirit Himself We may very easily lose that contact in a mist of words and I hope that in all the week it may be possible to arrange, not only at the beginning but in the course of Congress periods of silence not so short as to end just when the discipline of silence is beginning but long enough to let the silence tell, and I venture to ask you who are members of the Congress not to be content to run about from meeting to meeting but to look upon yourselves as charged by the Spirit of this Conference to leave time, even if it means restricting the number of meetings you attend, to let whatever you have heard instruct you and lay its hold upon you so that it may become your own and you yourselves be filled with the prayer and utterance of the Holy Spirit of God I know that this diocese has been well prepared by your Bishop for this Congress I hope you will also prepare

yourselves so that the effect of this Congress upon the Church will be real and true Who can tell what new accesses of life and light and fire and power might come to a Church which really and deliberately turns its mind, soul and will to the Eternal Spirit? May this Congress, at the bidding of its President, summon the Church of England to this great endeavour

I

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT (a) IN NATURE

(1) By (the late) J GEORGE ADAMI, CBE, M D, FRS,

Vice Chancellor of the University of Liverpool

IN appearing before this Congress the student of science or natural philosophy is at a great disadvantage as compared with other speakers. Those others, of known point of view, need waste no time in explaining themselves, they can launch immediately into their subject. But even to day, as for the last fifty years, there prevail such wholly erroneous views as to what science really is, what are its methods, what its standpoint, that as a student of science I cannot embark upon my subject proper—the Eternal Spirit in Nature—before I make quite clear to you the nature of scientific thought, with the result that much of the limited time at my disposal must be devoted to prolegomena. I shall, however, be amply repaid if I can demonstrate to this great audience that contrary to the teaching of the market place science and religion are essentially, or shall I say basally, at one as regards the greater things.

This oneness is by no means universally admitted even by leaders in the world of science. I remember, as vividly as if it were yesterday, sitting at *dejeuner* one mid day in late April in a little Parisian courtyard on the *rive gauche*, with the sun glinting on the silver and glass ware and the shadows of the thin spring foliage playing over the table linen. That was just thirty five years ago. I was working then at the Institut Pasteur, and my host was Emile Roux, Pasteur's great first lieutenant, who a few years later

was to succeed his master as head of the Institut and as leader of the French bacteriologists. Knowing the long and intimate association between the two great men, I put to my host a matter which had puzzled me: "Why was it that in all his series of notable communications to the Academie on immunity, arrest of disease and the amelioration of the lot of man and the animal creation, Pasteur never once referred to matters spiritual? With his imagination and enthusiasm, opening out as he was a new world of possibilities, it seemed natural that he could not be silent on these matters. Was he an agnostic?" Nor shall I ever forget Roux's reply. "Pasteur an agnostic! Pasteur, the man of simple faith, whose home life was a revelation of an exquisite piety, husband, wife and all the household carrying out devotedly, so far as laymen might, the rules and offices of the Church! No, most assuredly not. But as to his never referring to religion in his addresses and published papers that was quite true. He did not, but this for a very definite reason. M. Pasteur held firmly that the spiritual life and the material life were wholly apart; that it was an impertinence, not to say an impiety, to seek to explain the one in terms of the other; that our science is lamentably limited, lamentably imperfect, and, what is more, is liable to profound change from generation to generation. What can we, inhabitants of one of the smallest satellites of one of the smallest suns, presume to know about the ordering and the meaning of the vast universe? How dare we presume to criticize our faith in terms of our presumed knowledge?" These, of course, are not Roux's *ipsissima verba*: they are my memory of the gist of the argument. And still to-day the fervent Catholic must, I imagine, uphold Pasteur's attitude.

Per contra, there exist men high in the world of

science, men often leading singularly lofty lives, who decline to acknowledge the existence of anything that cannot be proved by material tests, who fail to find evidence of the existence of God or of a world of the spirit. Their philosophy may be summed up in the phrase "If you are in the game, play it." They are almost wistfully tender towards those who possess faith. We thus admittedly have these two strongly contrasted groups. But between them there is a notable and constantly augmented number of students to whom neither of these extreme views has any appeal. And it is the attitude of this intermediate group, as I see it, that I want to put before you to day.

Equally with the man of religion and the deductive or speculative philosopher, the student of science is a seeker after the truth, but his mode of procedure is, I think, not generally understood. Certainly it was not understood or taught by the dominant scientists of the mid Victorian era. Those held that the laws which had been discovered regarding material phenomena had been tested and proved, and were therefore fixed and immutable, representing the exact truth upon which they could proceed to build a sound superstructure. This century has brought home to us the soundness of Pasteur's contention that matters accepted as fact by one generation are found not to be fact by the next, or more accurately, are to be accepted as facts only within certain definite limits.

When we come to inquire more carefully into the scientific method we find that at most it is based upon a series of *approximations to the truth*. As Professor Field has recently emphasized, the first great step in science is classification, i.e. the recognition that phenomena at first sight so widely remote as to give a familiar example, the fall of an apple from the tree to the ground and the revolution

of the planets round the sun, belong to the same category. Yet the second, and equally essential, if not more important, step is to find a formula which will express the nature of these relationships. And now the man of science proceeds to use his imagination and to make and test and reject one assumption after another, until finally, if he is fortunate, he discovers some one assumption or hypothesis which, when tested, is found to cover and satisfy all cases of a common category known to him. And if other workers find that it satisfies all their cases also, then it becomes accepted as a "natural law" and becomes used for further advance.

What I want you to grasp is this: *first*, that all natural laws are based upon assumptions and therefore do not and cannot pretend to be truth absolute: at most they are approximations to the truth; and, *secondly*, that where one solitary fact is discovered which does not conform with a hitherto established natural law, not the fact but the law has to disappear or, rather, has to be modified to conform with the fact.

Time forbids that I do more than glance, as it were, at illustrations supporting these two conclusions. As regards the first, all of you who recall vestiges of your Euclid will remember that the oldest of all the sciences—plane and solid geometry—is based upon axioms of self-evident truth and *postulates* or assumptions—or laws—which must be taken for granted, since they are not capable of proof by the ordinary processes of logic. You will remember also that in his *Principia*, upon which we base the whole vast development of physics and astronomy of the last two centuries, Newton did not pretend to lay down what gravitation was: he merely said, If you will accept these assumptions of mine, you will find that all known cases of attraction of solid bodies one to the other will fall into line; and what is more,

you will, I trust, be able to solve all kinds of problems regarding the movements of bodies in space. And, sure enough, during two centuries and more Newton's laws were tested and not found wanting. And then, since the beginning of this century, comes Einstein and shows that Newton's laws are all very well for a world of three dimensions, but let us assume that there is a fourth, a time-space dimension, and then we must predicate a wholly different series of relationships. This he proceeded to do, and as you all know, observers in different parts of the world have tested and confirmed Einstein's theory.

This brings me to illustrations of my second point. Einstein's work in itself, and this confirmation by independent observers, have, as it were at a blow, rendered Euclid's postulates and Newton's laws only relatively, and no longer, as we used to think, absolutely, correct. The same fate, since the beginning of this century, has affected another great law, namely, John Dalton's Atomic Law, to which we owe very largely the vast development of synthetic and analytic chemistry during the nineteenth century. Dalton assumed that ultimately each *element* is composed of indivisible units, or atoms, each unit possessing a specific weight, and that every chemical compound is made up of an exact number of atoms of one element combined with an exact number of atoms of another element or elements. But now during these last few years J. J. Thomson, and Rutherford and his school, have shown that the atom, far from being an ultimate and indivisible unit, is a most complicated constellation of positive and negative electrons or charges of electricity: that an element like radium is constantly breaking down and liberating another element, helium. Thus Dalton's law is now seen to be only valid under a limited group of conditions, and our views

upon the nature of matter are entirely altered.

The method of science, or natural or practical philosophy, is thus that of the search after truth by progressive assumptions. The method of ordinary or speculative philosophy is to eschew assumptions, and to seek to arrive at exact truth not by imagination but by ratiocinative methods alone.

Let me propound to you a parable. As a boy I looked out from my bedroom window at the top of the house over the wide ees or water meadows of the Mersey, with the sluggish river meandering through them in wide curves, to where, some half mile away, the old Bridgewater canal crossed both ees and river—the first canal to be constructed in England, the better part of two centuries ago. Presently I found out the significant history of just that section of the canal. It was here that Brindley, the Duke of Bridgewater's self taught engineer, encountered what appeared to be an impossible state of affairs that presaged the complete failure of the undertaking. No sooner was earth placed to form an embankment to carry the canal across the ees than it was swallowed up, cartload after cartload, by the quicksands. This was long before the days of caissons and cement. The Duke was thrifty and his capital limited. To suck out the quicksands by huge pumps, or by any other means to get down to rock bottom and then build a solid causeway across the river bed, was wholly beyond either the engineering or the financial resources of those days. So Brindley, after his habit, took to his bed, if I remember aright, for the better part of a week. Then he rose and ordered some thousands of loads of brushwood to be brought. These he laid down over the ees, and in this way floated his embankment and his canal across the water meadows. Generations have passed, and still that canal remains

fulfilling its functions, carrying coal and heavy merchandise between Worsley and Manchester, and Runcorn and the sea

This is the parable of science and of metaphysics. If you wait until you have reached the rock bottom of absolute truth upon which to build, you may wait—I admit in most distinguished company, from Plato to Bosanquet—but you will wait in vain, for you will still be where you were, in the quicksands. At most, in the process of much digging you may sharpen your tools to an extraordinary degree. If, on the other hand, you study and take advantage of the properties of quicksands you may build over them, and advance.

And here, taking leave of the speculative philosophers—whose arguments from Plato onwards have been powerless to prove the existence of God, let me insist that the method of the pragmatist or practical philosopher and the scientist is the same. He accepts as truth, adequate for present purposes, that which when tested is found to satisfy, or solve most satisfactorily, the problems to which it is applied. He accepts ideas, or assumptions, which by processes of logic appear to be incapable of proof, but which are shown to be adequate, and to this extent valid, when put to the test of experience, and he works on these, and by scientific discipline establishes progressively a series of laws which may be accepted by all workers. He employs, in fact, the method of Newton, who did not attempt to prove the existence of attraction between solid bodies, but showed that when certain assumptions had been made and worked upon, all cases of the movements and mutual relationships of solid bodies, from the stars downwards, fell into order.

So in the case of religion. My part has been to show that the methods of approach to science and

religion are identical. I want to make it clear that the scientist may come to a clear knowledge of religious truth by the very methods he has employed at his own work. {A man's faith is not built upon reason but upon conviction and that conviction may rise from a series of assumptions made and accepted as in the case of natural laws. / In brief we cannot *prove* that there is a God but our conviction of His existence may be arrived at by progressive assumptions.

But you will object —A great gulf is fixed between Science and Religion the assumptions of the former are proved valid by actual material experiment in matters spiritual experiment is impossible. At most we fall back upon experience to establish the validity of our convictions and experiment and experience while analogous are not the same. Quite so but it must be remembered that most of the sciences of to day depend upon experience—some of them entirely—as a means of advance. It is only the exact sciences mathematics and the physico chemical group that base themselves in their entirety upon experiment. The more modern sciences—of language for example of sociology and political economy—are entirely based upon experience. As to the relative value and dependability of experiment and experience I would say this that whereas a single experiment is most often to be trusted a single personal experience is largely valueless. It is the summation of a vast number of concordant experiences that has scientific value and in the absence of direct experiment this and this only can be depended upon for the establishment of natural laws.

So in the spiritual world A man may come to a knowledge of God by a series of assumptions which point to one end and which tested by experience

stand firm and throw other spiritual truths into place. In such a way his whole faith may be built up. This, I would contend, may be the reverent attitude of the student of science. But let me emphasize, in all humility, that the truth revealed is not absolute but approximate, whether in the matter of experiment and experience, whether in science or religion. In this world we can see but through a glass darkly, we must wait for further revelation and fuller knowledge.

. . .

And thus it is that at long last I come to the subject matter of this address, namely, the Spirit of God in Nature as realized by a student of science. I have purposely spent time in defining his approach to God, in showing it as a rational and a personal approach which can stand the test of experience. If my treatment of the subject proper has to be somewhat concentrated in consequence, it will I trust be clear and definite.

To begin at the beginning, that student is faced with the three primary assumptions: (1) that there is no God, (2) that there are many Gods, and (3) that there is one God governing all things. He is forced to dismiss the first of these because, without some directing principle, Nature and life are meaningless. As regards the second, the progressive experience of mankind during the historical period has dismissed it. The recognition of law and order throughout the universe, the recognition, further, that there cannot be law and order without some controlling and directing force, makes the third the only possible assumption. We thus arrive at the first great spiritual law of Nature—One God governing all things.

The acceptance of this first great law calls for or

necessitates—as Professor Eddington¹ points out—a second namely *that He is beneficent*, or, shall I say, *that under His direction Nature moves towards ever increasing perfection*. For again any other hypothesis is meaningless. As a corollary to this second and essential conception we are forced to assume that the endowment of matter with the attributes of life and the evolution of living creatures are means to this one end.

Realizing the marvellous vastness of the universe thus controlled by the Deity, and that it is only under the very special conditions of temperature, carbon, oxygen and other relationships that man has been evolved on the surface of one of the smallest of the planets it is wholly presumptuous on our part to regard God as possessing human shape or human attributes. By no effort of our imagination can we picture Him more precisely than as a spirit, omnipotent and omnipresent. We are sensible of this in moments of spiritual alertness and awareness. We perceive His expression in the beauty and wonder of the material world. A sunset may be in technical language a mere collection of coloured lines and spots but it may bear for us a spiritual significance inexpressible in words. We are convinced that, however it may be accounted for by natural means it is a spiritual sign and symbol. It betokens a vast, eternal controlling Power which cannot be expressed or imagined in finite language.

We have said that the student sees Nature moving towards an ever increasing perfection directed by a beneficent spirit. The evolution of man upon our planet from the lowest forms of amœbic life to the finest product of humanity is proof of this advance and the development and progress of life in the

¹ In his lecture *The Domain of Physical Science in Science Religion and Reality*

natural and in the scientific worlds is but another proof. But let us go one step further. If there is advance, there is also failure. How can we reconcile the two? Surely thus. Perfection is seen to be the final end, but pain and suffering are permitted, are indeed within the will and purpose of the Spirit. They are part of the whole plan, and they may be found, if accepted as from an all powerful love and wisdom, as part of the progressive purpose, as actual means of fulfilling the perfect end and will of the Eternal Spirit—necessary for the whole plan in its entire fulfilment. And as we take a further view still, we students of science may see that even death is as necessary as life to the final ordering of the universe, for were the world to be inhabited by beings incapable of death, yet subject in the course of ages to repeated maimings, then regression, not progression, would be the result. And while at times it may be difficult to reconcile the ruthlessness of the struggle, the pain, the misery, the pitiful dominance of the strong over the weak, with the existence and ruling of a beneficent Deity, we are forced to conclude that not only is there some wider plan than we can see which permits and uses these elements, but also that this life is not the end—that the endowment of matter with these properties which constitute life has meant the simultaneous endowment of them with something spiritual, which persists after the matter has become broken up and disorganized—in fact, *that the soul is immortal*.

Is the student of science to draw back here? No. The foundation of his spiritual conviction may be found in his natural instincts. "I am certain of nothing," said Keats, "but the hollowness of the heart's affections and the truths of the imagination." In that first line there lies the core of belief in the life to come. The supremest moments of human

love have in them something eternal and spiritual they are of such a nature that I know that the soul which partakes of them cannot perish Had I no Christian hope I should be assured of my own immortality by these apprehensions and these movements breathings as I believe them to be of the Spirit within us

Oh God within my breast
 Almost ever present Deity
 Life that in me has rest
 As I undying life have power in Thee

It is when whether as students of science and the natural world or of religion and spiritual truths that we are brought into direct contact with these great conceptions of life and death when we are most baffled by the apparent conflict between struggle and advance happiness and pain that we are flung back upon the vast background of the eternal and all pervading Spirit for satisfaction and solution Yet it is at this very part I would say that our progress is arrested The Spirit is too vast for our finite needs We need someone we can comprehend something we can picture We need indeed what we are given in the fulness of time—*Jesus Christ*

Quite apart from the historical evidence of His being and His sayings which I hold must be accepted there is the extraordinarily significant fact that His appearance upon earth coincided with human developments and human needs So long as man worshipped a tribal or a national god or gods he could endow him or them with human attributes and with this could experience a personal approach and personal relationships So soon as such conception of the Deity no longer satisfied and man passed to contemplate a single God ruler and controller of the whole universe not as a human being but as a spirit infinitely beyond man from that moment do you

not see the absolute need there was for one who was *not* impersonal and unapproachable, but for one who was God in human shape, who could as man interpret God to man whom man through his manhood could understand whose example and whose teaching made possible the higher spiritual life? Jesus was the great need of the world, translating the purpose of the Spirit by His words and His life, translating the unformed longings of the human heart into their true worship and expression. And our earlier assumptions simply lead us to conviction of His reality. He is the living expression of our faith the final end of our slow and often painful progress in religious belief.

Strong Son of God immortal love
Whom we that have not seen Thy face
By faith and faith alone embrace
Believing where we cannot prove

He is the key to all our spiritual apprehension and striving. He is the hope of the world and the certainty of our immortality. And as He stooped to enter this natural world so He made use of it. The natural gifts of bread and wine are charged by Him with eternal significance and become instruments of the divine Spirit. For transcending all else in human experience and acting as the culmination of Christ's message to us is His ordination of the Blessed Sacrament of Holy Communion. Whatever view a man may take regarding what happens upon Consecration this is certain that drawing near in the right spirit and partaking of the bread and wine he does enter into communication with the Holy Ghost, and does experience the divine indwelling and from this onwards through prayer and communion there may be ever closer and closer union of his individual human being with the divine.

I have dwelt at length upon what may be the

progress of a rational and ordered mind in apprehending the divine Spirit, and I hope I have shown that it can lead to one end only—Christ. May I conclude by offering you a parallel of which I have lately become acutely conscious. If we read the lives and the writings of the great mystics we shall see that the stages of their ascent may be roughly divided into Christocentric and Theocentric. In the earlier stages many of them confine themselves to meditation upon the life of Christ, His words, His passion and His death. Farther on as a natural sequence, they become so absorbed in the life of God so penetrated with the divine Spirit that they can hardly find words to express it. The further they are advanced in spiritual apprehension of the Godhead the harder it is to explain it. So they employ terms of natural imagery, Air, Light, Heat, Fire, Flame—poor and finite still yet seeking to express the boundlessness and the majesty of the Spirit whom they have come to realize and to know. So it may be as I see it, for the student of science though in reverse order. The more and the longer he ponders upon the workings of the Eternal Spirit, the more in my opinion will he be thrust back upon the life of Christ as the eternal expression of that Spirit. And conversely if he dares to build in religion as he does in science and relies upon the experience he has gained he will find that he will grow into ever wider and wider knowledge of spiritual truth and spiritual apprehension so that like the Theocentric mystic words and imagery will fail him. Yet, however wide and deep his knowledge of the Spirit's workings it can indeed only be expressed in *one way*. More and more as the years have passed I become convinced that the love of God is everything and that if a man possesses this all other things are secondary.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT (a) IN NATURE

(11) By REV J C HARDWICK, M A , B Sc ,

Vicar of Partington, Manchester

A RECENT anthropological treatise says of a certain primitive tribe that when asked why they did not worship a particular deity in whose existence they believed, replied 'Why should we? He has never done us any harm!' This would seem to indicate that when primitive man takes the trouble to worship the powers which he believes to inhabit nature, he does so because he regards them as being actually or potentially hostile. When he does worship nature, it is not because he regards her in the light of a friend.

This attitude of suspicion and fear is dictated by the fact that the control exercised by primitive man over nature is uncertain and precarious. Forces which are imperfectly mastered are naturally regarded as capricious forces which it is dangerous, even though it may be necessary, to handle.

With ourselves, on the contrary, the case is very different. Our troubles do not spring from a lack of control over nature. We have subjected nature to a control which is rapidly becoming more and more complete.

It is worth noticing that as control over nature increases indifference to nature tends to develop. That which we understand, and that which we can manage, we tend to despise. Tchekov says of one of his characters that "he was fond of nature, but he regarded it as something long familiar and at the same time, in reality, infinitely beneath himself, and created for his pleasure. He would sometimes

stand still before some magnificent landscape and say 'It would be nice to have tea here!'

This sort of attitude would have seemed blasphemous to primitive man, he had not yet reached the point when one could patronise nature.

This increased control over nature, which is what separates us from the savage far more than any moral, spiritual or mental differences, has been a product of a quite recent development of the natural sciences. Yet this increased control has been, in reality, only a by-product of that development. The primary contribution of the natural sciences has been a total transformation of our view of nature.

In the first place, ever since Galileo arrived at his principle of *inertia* viz., that "all motion is perpetual until force interferes to alter and modify it," the universe, and all that is in it, has come to be regarded as a vast automatic machine. Nature has been depersonalized, she is no longer, as she seemed to the savage, hostile or capricious, she is worse, she is indifferent. This indifference of a mechanical nature has been emphasized by the vast extent of the universe, both in space and in time. As Mr Thomas Hardy has said "It is quite impossible to think at all adequately of the sky without thinking of it as a nightmare."

But the impersonality and immensity of nature, as revealed by science, are perhaps not its most formidable features. Science has disclosed these formidable qualities in inanimate nature, but animate nature, the world of life, the world to which we ourselves belong seems to display qualities which are not so much formidable as revolting. I quote from a letter by which a distinguished naturalist replied to my enquiry

'Is there anything much more deliberately revolting than the calm way in which many spiders

pack their living victims, bind them tight, and then slowly suck their blood? Again the behaviour of large numbers of parasites is devilish in its deliberation, though beautiful in its precision and results. The ichneumon wasp stings the caterpillar, thus rendering it partly helpless—deadening its struggles but not destroying its life. The caterpillar is then dragged to the "nest," where it is packed in, alive, with other victims, and an egg (or in some cases, eggs) of the wasp. The egg hatches, and the larval wasp devours the living, helpless caterpillar."

Furthermore, biological science seems to have revealed the fact that all living species are the result of a process of development of which a ruthless struggle for survival has formed an integral part. And even for the perfected products of this evolutionary process there is no peace. Existence, attained by the painful struggles of progenitors, can only be preserved by similar struggles. Life, as the author of the Book of Job rightly declared, is a warfare. Even the peaceful woodland as a poem of R. L. Stevenson reminds us is a battlefield where quarter is neither asked nor given.

The war of the vegetable world is implacable but silent. The victor throttles or starves its victim, and no cry is heard. Hence the illusion of peace. But in the animal world the struggle is more obvious. Here an inexhaustible fertility of offspring presses hard upon a food supply which is limited. Many are born, few survive, and fewer still leave offspring. Life and the ability to procreate are the rewards of vigour, ferocity, patient fortitude, and cunning. The species which shewed mercy to its enemies would speedily become extinct.

And it is to ancestors of this sort, and to a process of this kind that mankind, so far as we can see, owes its existence. And even when he has emerged from

the animal state, man remains subject to the same conditions "As among other animals, multiplication goes on without cessation, and involves severe competition for the means of support The strongest, the most self assertive, tend to tread down the weaker "

As humanity develops, no doubt the cruder elements in this process of struggle and elimination are modified "Social progress," said T H Huxley, "means a checking of the cosmic process at every step and the substitution for it of another, which may be called the ethical process' This is based on mutual helpfulness and intelligent co operation—upon a repudiation of the "gladiatorial theory of existence "

But it should not be overlooked that man develops, or becomes more civilized and humane, not by following Nature, but by repudiating her An appreciation of this fact led T H Huxley to declare that

"The ethical progress of society depends not on imitating the cosmic process still less in running away from it, but in combating it The history of civilization details the steps by which men have succeeded in building up an artificial world within the cosmos "

Thus if the physical sciences seem to reveal to us a Nature which is impersonal and indifferent, biological science seems to reveal her as plainly hostile to our ethical and social ideals Man seems to stand over against a Nature which is indifferent or hostile to him and his ideals

If the foregoing view of Nature be the true view, it will be impossible to identify the Spirit behind Nature with the Holy Spirit of Christian experience and belief The spirit behind Nature, if spirit there be, is sinister, cruel, indifferent, and though

marvellously intelligent, cares nothing for what we call good and evil. If we wish to find a Spirit which is Holy, we must look for it (if the foregoing view of Nature is the true one) not in Nature, but either in the heart of Man, or in some sphere outside both nature and humanity.

But this amounts to admitting a fundamental contrast between the God of nature, and the God of religion—a dualism which Christian theology, very early in its history, examined and rejected. And before admitting this dualism, we shall do well to explore afresh our conception of nature.

It was suggested above that what dismays us in physical, or inanimate nature is (1) its stupendous extent, both in space and in time, and (2) the fact that it seems to be an automatic machine. As for biological, or animate, nature, what appals us here is its apparent indifference to our ethical ideals.

With regard to the question of size and extent, however, we have to remember that these are purely relative conceptions. From the point of view of the stellar universe, a human being is of infinitesimal size, whereas, from the point of view of the atom, and still more so from that of the electron, a man would be incalculably immense. Size is relative to some particular standard of reference. Anatole France somewhere reminds us that if the whole universe were to shrink suddenly to the dimensions of a walnut, no one would be any the wiser. The shrinkage would pass unnoticed because everything would shrink in proportion. "The pole star, enclosed with us in a nutshell would take, as before, fifty years to despatch to us her light." Furthermore, the criterion of value is not size. "With space the universe encloses me and engulfs me like an atom," says Pascal, "but with thought I enclose the

universe." "All bodies," he says again, "the firmament, the stars, the earth and its kingdoms, are not worth the smallest mind, for a mind knows them and itself, and bodies know nothing."

With regard to the universe being a mechanism, before people are troubled by this idea, they should be clear in their own minds what they mean by a mechanism. All artificial mechanisms are inspired by mind, i.e. constructed for a purpose; and the more automatic they are, the more developed must be the intelligence that has devised them, and the more easy it becomes to overlook its presence. The mere existence of mechanism is itself a problem. Furthermore, mechanism may be universal, and yet play a subordinate part in the scheme of things. If material things did not display regular modes of behaviour (i.e. act mechanically) it would be impossible for conscious mind or purpose to make any use of them. It is only because we can rely on the "uniformity of nature" that we can control our environment. It is because our bodies are mechanisms that they are our servants. The fact that inanimate Nature is a mechanism does not render it hostile, though this may render it indifferent. But the indifference of nature need affect us no more than the indifference of a chisel. A tool is indifferent, and takes no conscious interest in the purposes for which it is used. Yet it is customary to speak of a "trusty" tool. The material universe is "trusty" in this sense; we can rely upon its behaviour.

Nowadays, however, the majority of people have become accustomed to the vast size, and to the mechanical nature of the material universe, and these conceptions are ceasing to cause us misgivings. The trouble begins when we consider the ways of animate Nature, the world of life. Here, as we have seen, there is much to revolt our sensibilities, both

in things as they are, and also in the evolutionary processes by which they have developed, and come to be what they are

It does not solve the problem to tell us that our scruples are "anthropomorphic," and that we have no right to judge the ichneumon wasp by our own moral standards. It may be quite true that the wasp does not accept our ethical ideals, but the question at issue is not the morality of the wasp, but a more important question, the morality of the universe. *If the wasp is a product of Nature, does its behaviour reflect the ideals of Nature—the spirit in Nature? Or may it not be that Nature has no ideals at all, but regards the behaviour of the wasp, and the behaviour of the man, alike with indifference?* In either case, from Nature's point of view, human ethical standards would be but a human prejudice with no objective validity.

Nor does it help to solve the problem, which is an ethical problem, to point to the perfection of these natural processes which revolt our moral sense. It is true that the wasp, with horrible ingenuity, stings its victim just at the right spot so as to paralyse it and yet keep it alive and the meat fresh. Also the larva, when hatched, indulges its appetite with just so much restraint as allows the living meat to last over the critical period for which it is required. Furthermore, the over abundant, highly destructive caterpillars are kept in check. "All works so that no species is destroyed, no species allowed to become so plentiful that it will compete with and injure others." But all that this proves is that Nature is ingenious, not that Nature is ethical, or at least that her ethical standards are not ours, nor so high as ours. The ethics of Nature would appear to be the ethics of the jungle. Nature stands for "the gladiatorial theory of existence."

There can be no doubt that the biological sciences do present serious difficulties for those who seek a Spirit in Nature which can, without any abuse of language, be called not merely wise, but holy; that is to say, a spirit embodying our highest moral ideals, a spirit that we can worship

It is possible, however, that our difficulties may arise from our regarding Nature as a completed system rather than as an incomplete process, or rather, as a process which has left behind it numerous products at different stages of completion. Each product is in its way perfect; the amœba not less so than the wasp, or the bird, or the man. But though equally perfect, they are not all equally developed. The amœba, though perfect as an amœba, stands far below the swallow as a product of evolutionary development. And the swallow, in turn, though perfect as a physical mechanism, stands below the man in complexity of nervous system, neural development being the next step, as we may call it, in the evolutionary scheme, or the creative process. Each stage is in its way perfect, but there exists an ascending series of stages, and between the different stages there are sometimes some very strong contrasts. And the contrasts seem to be contrasts of *value*. The swallow we feel to be higher than the slug, even though the slug is in its way perfect. Again, we feel that a human being is of more value than a bird. Nor is this merely a subjective prejudice, for a man is a more developed product of the evolutionary process than a bird, as a bird is than a slug.

If this be a reasonable way of looking at things, we can understand why it is that human beings, being the latest product of the creative process, do not find themselves always in harmony with the habits and ideals of the earlier stages. The ethical system of the wasp will not satisfy a man, though it may

seem natural enough to the wasp, and perhaps even to its victim

Now, while it is true that Nature is the common mother of the amœba, the slug, the swallow, and the man, and, therefore, must accept responsibility for them all, yet we may feel justified in regarding human beings (being her latest product) as embodying the purpose of Nature more fully than any of her less developed offspring—though these may not be without their value for Nature too, and may play their part in the scheme of things

Thus, if we are going to form an estimate of Nature, or the Spirit behind Nature, we should judge her, not by the amœba, or the slug, or the ichneumon wasp, but rather by her latest product, man. She has produced these creatures for the same reason as makes a fountain throw its waters a foot high, and a yard high, before it can get them six feet high. The higher stages involve the lower stages, but it is in the highest stage that Nature's purpose is displayed. This way of looking at things resolves that dualism which identifies Nature with her lower products only, e.g. with the wasp, and which regards man and his ideals as standing outside Nature, in which case there certainly is no way of avoiding the conclusion that the spirit in Nature is one that we cannot worship. The best evidence for the "holiness" (i.e. worshipfulness) of the spirit behind Nature is that it should have produced man and his ideals. This resolves Huxley's dualism between the universe and man. Man and the universe are not at war, nature has produced and fostered man, though man may find that he has outgrown the ways of some of the lower products of the creative process. He may feel revolted by the behaviour of the wasp, or even by some relics or traces of his own humble ancestry which lurk within his own soul

But the battle, if battle there be, is not between man and nature, but between the higher and the lower products of the one creative process.

From the foregoing it may seem to be but one step to the conclusion that Man is a perfect revelation of the creative spirit in Nature. But this is not a step which I am prepared to take. The belief in Man, as we find it in Rousseau, or Swinburne, or the sentimentalists in general, is the latest, and perhaps the least rational, of the superstitions, as it is certainly the most dangerous of them all.

Although Man is at present the highest product of the creative process, we need not suppose that he is all that this process is capable of producing. St. Paul thought otherwise. He speaks of creation as still groaning and travailing, and of Christ as the first-born of many brethren, and as the "New Adam," i.e. the forerunner of a new humanity. This view would regard the creative process as being still unexhausted, as still striving to complete itself, with man as its growing point. In man the creative spirit in Nature is still active.

An idea superficially similar to this has been elaborated by Nietzsche, and in our own day by the eccentric genius of Mr. Bernard Shaw. The Superman of these prophets, however, bears no resemblance to the vision of the Apostle. Nietzsche's ideal seems to involve a return to the gladiatorial theory of existence; whereas Mr. Shaw seems to look chiefly for an increase of political and economic prudence—qualities desirable, no doubt, but in no sense divine.

St. Paul's vision is that of men striving to attain to an entirely new quality of life, as far removed from ordinary human (or "natural") life, as human life is from that of the animal: a type of life of which it is impossible to anticipate the nature from

what we know of this life, just as it would be impossible, if life were unknown, to anticipate what life would be from a survey of inanimate nature.

These ideas may seem to lie outside the scope of this paper, which deals with the Spirit in Nature. Yet these considerations, far from being irrelevant, are indispensable to a right understanding of the subject. For just as the Creative Spirit in Nature cannot be understood apart from its latest product man, even in him that spirit cannot be fully understood, for he is not (according to our theory) its final product. At the stage before man appeared on this planet the Creative Spirit was not fully revealed in its latest product, the animal. In the same way, man as he now is cannot reveal the character of the Spirit in Nature.

If the question be put, where a full revelation of the nature of that Spirit is to be found, the answer would be, in Christ. For he reveals the new quality of life of which it is the purpose of the Creative Spirit that man should partake. Thus Christ and that Spirit are one. In Him the Creative Spirit "took flesh"—the ideal became actual.

In the foregoing, one aspect of Nature has been deliberately overlooked, and can only (although important) be dealt with very briefly here. We have hitherto been primarily concerned with the apparently non-ethical aspects of Nature, because the problems raised by them are more acute than any others. But what may be called the æsthetic aspect of Nature should not be forgotten. This aspect of Nature has profoundly impressed even those whom her non-ethical aspects have compelled to take up an attitude of cosmic pessimism. The beauties of Nature alone consoled Schopenhauer for the miseries of life, they are "a cathartic of the mind."

"Whenever natural beauty discloses itself suddenly

to our view, it almost always succeeds in delivering us, though it may be only for a moment, from the slavery of the will. The man who is tormented by passion, or want, or care, is revived, cheered and restored."

For many, as for the poet Wordsworth, the beauties of Nature are an avenue through which is reached that Eternal world which the saint enters through contemplation and prayer.

But if philosophers, poets, and mystics are inspired by the beauty of inanimate Nature, the man of science is deeply conscious of the incomparable beauty and perfection of the world of life. Every organism is a triumph of fitness and delicate beauty. Everywhere there is that beauty which is the accompaniment, or the equivalent, of perfect fitness. And this beauty in the whole of Nature, not less than the goodness of her highest products, reveals the character of the Spirit in Nature. For that Spirit, beauty as well as goodness, is a supreme value.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT: (b) IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA

(1) By D. C. SIMPSON, D.D.,

*Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy
Scripture in the University of Oxford,
and Canon of Rochester.*

IN the forty minutes allotted to me I propose first of all to summarize Israel's heritage from earlier thought and from foreign sources in regard to the "Spirit." Only by doing this can we rightly appreciate the various "fruits of the Spirit," to which I shall next invite your attention, as revealed to us in the record of the "Spirit's" working in Israel between the time of Moses and the beginning of the Christian era.

First then let us consider Israel's heritage from the past and from other nations in regard to the "Spirit." Men had been conscious, dimly conscious it may be, but still conscious, of the working of the Divine "Spirit" long before the Hebrew nation came into existence. They had already realized the simplicity, beauty, and the real fitness of referring to the Divine action in the world as the action of, or as mediated through, "wind" or "spirit" or "breath." This conception and this way of expressing it seem to lie at the back of so much Egyptian religious terminology that there are not wanting scholars who maintain that it was in Egypt that the idea, the language and the terminology of the "Spirit" first made their appearance. We have still fuller evidence from Mesopotamia as to the antiquity of this conception. But there is no time for me to give specific instances,

to discuss the use of the Babylonian word SHARU ("breath," "wind") in this connection,¹ to compare it with the Hebrew words RUACH and NEŠAMAH or even to indicate the original and technical uses of these Hebrew words.²

I will merely outline to you how, probably in comparatively primitive times, early man in general, living at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean and in Mesopotamia, came to find in the terminology of the "Spirit" the most satisfactory way by which he could give expression to his conviction of the existence of, and the interference by, the Divine in the mundane and human spheres. It must have happened quite naturally, though none the less providentially, in some such way as this—Primitive man—by that I mean man at a time long prior to the rise of the Hebrews, prior probably to the rise of Semitic culture in Mesopotamia, prior even to that of Egypt—began to question the whence, the why, the whither of his existence. He observed that the "breath" was the *sine qua non* of his own existence, and of animal existence in general. Its first intaking resulted in life³ its last exit from the body was the immediate prelude to death, was in fact the end of his conscious personality—just as later thought, postulating life after death, first of all depicted it as the re-entering of the dead body by "Spirit," the re-animation of the personality which in the interval had been dormant or non-existent. It was the ultimate energising force, a force which existed both before and after its association with the

¹ See J. Hohn, *zum Problem des Geistes im alten Orient und im A.T.* in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1925, pp. 210-225.

² See H. Wheeler Robinson *The Psychology and Metaphysics of Thus saith Jahweh* in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1923 pp. 1-15.

³ Cf. Job xxxiii 4, Zech. xii 1.

⁴ Cf. Job xxxiv 14, Eccles. iii, 21, xii 7.

material frame of each individual, independent of it and outside it

That of it present in each individual, could be called "the spirit" of that individual, "*his spirit*,"¹ while in him, though before and during, and after its presence in him, it was also a fragment, a part, of the universal breath or "*Spirit*"² Its origin was divine it belonged to the "God (or gods) of the spirits of all flesh"³ If you ask "Then as you speak of it as a 'fragment,' do you mean that they regarded it or the God to whom it belonged as a *material* something?" I must reply that for long they did not distinguish between the material and the immaterial Neither did they have any clear conception of correlatives such as transcendent and immanent, eternal and transient, which to us are commonplaces, but which to them were as yet unknown concepts Of one thing of course they had no doubt the Divine was for them real beyond all question They had as yet no inkling of the truth that there can be but one God but they certainly never imagined for one moment that there was no God whatsoever More over they realized more clearly than some 19th century philosophers that the divine was essentially personal, though they had no conception of what we mean by 'impersonal' They were even prepared to regard, though in a rough and ready fashion, as personal what we should describe unquestionably as inorganic or impersonal Thus, to give but one instance, that lofty mountain in the near distance upon which they scarcely dared to set their feet, round which the mighty thunders roared the lightnings leaped from peak to peak the running living,

¹ Cf Gen xl 8 xlv 27 Dt ii 30 ISa xxx 12 Job vi 4 Ps xxxi 5 exli 7 Prov xxv 28

² Cf Job xxvii 3 xxxiv 14 Eccles xii 7 Mal ii 15

³ Cf Numbers xvi 22 xxvii 16

waters that issued from it, the forest trees that grew upon its slopes, the restless sea that incessantly lapped its base, above all the wind, the incomprehensible wind, the breath, the "spirit," that lashed itself into fury nowhere so energetically as on its summit—all this was further evidence of the presence of energizing force, of "Spirit"; it was as real to them as that which animated themselves. It was not necessarily, in fact the probabilities were against its being, the same "spirit," that is the "spirit" of the same God as He Who animated "living souls" (i.e. individual animals). At times they predicated a variety of gods who each corresponded to one of this multiplicity of "Spirits."

But one thing was clear. Human beings were capable of a fuller indwelling of the "Spirit" than that minimum of indwelling necessary for the preservation of normal physical and mental existence. Such further indwelling of the "Spirit" gave to some greater skill in war¹ or in building.² To some it gave greater power, as for instance to the head of the tribe or the king of the nation.³ To some a fuller consciousness of the divine, as for instance to soothsayers, wizards, medicine-men, seers and prophets.⁴ To some, sad to relate it gave a greater propensity (as we should say) to sickness, disease, misfortune. This last, this tragic endowment, they often called an "evil spirit,"⁵ evil as indeed it was in its effects. At times they saw no incongruity in identifying it with the "Spirit" of the same God Who infused into them

¹ Cf. *Judg.* iii. 10; vi. 34; xi. 29, etc.

² Cf. *Ex.* xxxi. 3; xxxv. 31.

³ Cf. *Sam.* xvi. 13. *Extra* i. 1. *Ps.* lxxvi. 12. *Is.* xi. 1 ff. *Hag.* i. 14. *Zech.* iv. 6.

⁴ Cf. *Numb.* xxiv. 2; *I Sam.* x. 10; xi. 6; xix. 20, 21, 23. *II Kings*, i. 9, 15. *Ez.* (see below), *Micah* ii. 11; iii. 8. *Dan.* iv. 9, 18; v. 14.

⁵ Cf. *I Sam.* xvi. 14, 15, 16, 23; xviii. 10; xix. 9. *Is.* xix. 14.

those other "Spirits" or endowments of happier omen

This was, in general, the kind of heritage, so far as the "Spirit" itself and "Spirit" terminology are concerned, which the Hebrews received from their Semitic ancestors. This, again, so far as "the Spirit" and "Spirit terminology" are concerned, was the kind of environment, stripped of details (into which I cannot now enter), in which they found themselves whether as in Abraham's day they lived in Ur or Haran, or as in later times they spent 400 years in Egypt, or later still imbibed it through the Canaanites or from Assyrian and Babylonian soldiers and traders

The first immediate contact which they experienced as a nation with their national God Jehovah was at Sinai. The physical phenomena which accompanied that theophany, the mountain top as it were on fire, the thunder, the lightning, the whirling wind, the hailstones and coals of fire, were all such as to dispose the Hebrew if he ever questioned it, in favour of continuing and developing, not discarding, his pre-Sinaitic conceptions alike of the Divine influence as "Spirit," and of the Divine providence as mediated in and through "Spirit." There was indeed little in what he had previously ascribed to the "Spirit," or to the "Spirits" of this or that god, that he could not now ascribe, with equal ease and with considerably more truth, to Jehovah Himself. He ascribed it to Jehovah conceived, in His relations with nature¹ and with themselves², as the God of the whirlwind and of the earthquake, the thunder and the lightning,³ the God of the raging "Spirit" of the whirlwind

¹ Gen 1 2 Job xxvi 13 Ps civ 4 Cf Judith xvi 14
II Baruch xxi 4 (see further below)

² Job xxxiii 4
³ Cf Judg v 4, 5, 20 Ps xviii 1-15 Hab iii 3 ff, etc

alike on Horeb and when at His behest it whirled Elijah to heaven,¹ or lifted Ezekiel above the conditions of time and space.² Jehovah became for them the God of the "Spirits" of all flesh.³ He was the God of the "Spirit" that rushed mightily upon Samson,⁴ the God of the "Spirit" that nerved Israel's first king to battle with the Philistines,⁵ the God Who afterwards, by means of an "evil Spirit"⁶ from Himself, drove Saul demented. He was the God at Whose court attended "Spirits" both "good" and "evil," the former inspiring Micaiah ben Imlah, the latter the prophets who urged Ahab to undertake his last ill-fated Syrian campaign.⁷ But he was also the God of the "Spirit" that inspired the Messiah,⁸ that inspired another, a truer prototype of the Incarnate One.⁹ He was the God, above all, Who will pour forth His "Spirit" upon all flesh in the latter days.¹⁰

In all this Israel, under the "Spirit's" influence, was but adapting to its new henotheistic, and in later times monotheistic, religion that which, in the matter of "Spirit" lore, had been its heritage from earlier religious ideas or came to it from its later Egyptian and Babylonian environments.

But greater fruits of the "Spirit" than this were soon to be apparent in the religion of Israel. First and foremost amongst these I would put the genius shewn by the Hebrew people, or rather by their Spirit-inspired prophets and religious leaders, in the treatment of a *variety of other ideas* in their heritage from the past and in their Egyptian and (chiefly as

¹ *II Kings* ii. 11. ² *Ex.* iii. 12, 14; viii. 3; xi. 24; xliii. 5.

³ *Numb* xvi. 22, xxvii. 16.

⁴ *Judg* xiii. 25; xiv. 6, 19; xv. 14.

⁵ *I Sam.* x. 6, xi. 6.

⁶ *I Sam* xvi. 14-23; xviii. 10; xix. 9.

⁷ *I Kings* xxii.

⁸ *Is.* xi. 1 ff. ⁹ *Is.* lxi. 1. ¹⁰ *Joel* ii. 28, 29.

it seems to me) Babylonian environments. The study of Religions, other than the four or five great ones that still exist to day, is still of quite recent growth. The comparative study of them is still in its infancy. Astonishing hypotheses and counter hypotheses are put forward suggesting that this, that and well nigh everything, once thought to be distinctively characteristic of Hebrew Religion or of Judaism, was borrowed, often clumsily enough, from this or that cult of Egypt or of Mesopotamia. But though many of these hypotheses are unproved and unprovable, the fact remains that in some respects and these numerous, just as in the case of their consciousness of the "Spirit" itself, the Hebrews did not discard their heritage from the past and from neighbouring nations. The solemn moment on Sinai was not for them a moment of religious revolution. It was the beginning of a spiritual evolution, an evolution, not without set backs it is true, but still an evolution by slow degrees moving ever onwards and upwards because directed and guided by the "Spirit" of Jehovah. Judaism must not be thought of as a patchwork of ideas derived from five or six different nations, or at least as a patchwork without design, a patchwork worthy of being put together only in a madhouse. Certainly not! As we have already seen, the "Spirit" had been at work moulding the ideas of primitive man, of Egypt, of Babylonia, it was also at work, let me add, in moulding the thought of Persia, Greece and Rome. Like the wind the "Spirit" bloweth where it listeth, like the wind it finds a seed here and a seed there and takes it up and whirls it along, aimlessly it may seem to the chance observer. But to the scientist, who next year ponders the results of this year's wind and its action on the seeds, a different tale unfolds itself. so too to us, who scientifically examine the results of the

"Spirit's" action in regard to religious ideas the whole world over, not chance, not fortuitous combination, but Divine foresight and Divine providence reveal themselves at work. It was in this way that Palestine, in God's good pleasure, became a great meeting-house for the reception of ideas of aspects of Him and partial truths about Him which the "Spirit" had revealed and which had been preserved in the religious beliefs of those lands. The Hebrew Religion in its turn became, through the "Spirit's" agency, the repository of these truths, reinforcing them, purifying them, sublimating them, welding them together, and adding to them by means of the "Spirit's" inspiration of its greatest Prophets, Psalmists, Apocalyptists, Wisdom Writers, and even Priestly Legislators.¹

It is to the "Spirit's" inspiration of these prophets and other religious leaders of Israel that I now want to turn your attention as being yet another noteworthy instance of the fruits of the "Spirit" in the Old Testament. Even as recently as twenty years ago the topic which I have just left would, I suppose, have found no place, or practically none, in this paper; whereas this section would then have been necessarily longer and would have been regarded as decidedly contentious. The method of the "Spirit's" working on or in the prophetic consciousness is now more generally realized and admitted, and I feel justified in expressing myself with the utmost brevity. The "Spirit's" influence on the ordinary mentality and ordinary intellectual and religious characteristics of a prophet's consciousness did not result in the stupefaction and suspension of his own peculiar gifts. What the "Spirit" did was what, under the

¹ See my somewhat fuller treatment of this topic in the Introduction to *The Psalmists*, 1926, pp. vii. ff.

influence of the "Spirit" as we have just observed, Hebrew Religion did in regard to the religious ideas borrowed from the religions of neighbouring nations. The "Spirit," instead of stupefying or for the time being taking away the mental and religious endowment of the man singled out to be a prophet or apocalypticist, stimulated it and intensified it. The "Spirit," instead of taking the place of a man's religious and mental consciousness, addressed itself directly to it thus awakened and quickened. The "Spirit," instead of uttering through the prophetic mouth-piece words of which the prophet himself was ignorant till he heard them spoken by himself, excited his intuitive faculties. Instead of, as it were, playing on the prophet's vocal chords as the harpist on the harp, which must needs therefore give forth only sound from the strings as and when touched by the harpist's fingers, the "Spirit" communicated to the prophet so much of the divine revelation as he, thus prepared, could assimilate. It left him to utter so much of the revelation as he could, in the language and the literary style which were peculiarly his own, and in expressions, formulae and parables which were intelligible to his contemporaries. For it was for the spiritual welfare of *his own contemporaries*, rather than for that of future generations, that the prophet was primarily inspired. In essence Prophetic Inspiration has been well said to differ only in degree from that of other men, but it is so great a quantitative difference as almost to amount to one of quality. The evidences of the inner ecstasy which at times marked the outward gestures of the inspired person were not of the essence of his inspirations. They belonged either to the early, more elementary, stage of prophecy when the prophet was inspired to raise the quite justifiable and necessary cry of nationalism, or to the period of their more or less artificial revival

in later times. It was the prophets of Baal, not the champion of Jehovah, who became ecstatic on Mount Carmel. The ecstatic or cataleptic symptoms revealed by Ezekiel were characteristic of his own abnormal nature, not an evidence or an essential component of his inspiration by the "Spirit."

Before I leave this aspect of the "fruits of the Spirit" let me add two remarks.

In the first place, as we have already observed, the "Spirit" bloweth where it listeth. It confined itself to no particular "order" of prophets, to no particular type of personality or contemplative mystic. Amos, practical and unemotional, was the first of the great prophets, yet none so strongly as he denied that he belonged to any professional or official order of prophets. The "Spirit" was capable of being—it is ideally—the goal of the spiritual longings, the actual possession, of every professing member of the Church of Israel. Was not the very founder of Israel's Religion reported to have said, in a narrative the *motif* of which is to emphasize this very truth, "Would that all Jehovah's people were prophets, would that He would put His 'Spirit' in them!"¹

In the second place the fundamental criterion for discriminating between the prophet truly inspired by the Holy Spirit of God and the false prophet (that is the prophet who consciously or unconsciously sets out to be a prophet when he is not inspired by the "Spirit") is still that laid down in the Hebrew law book promulgated in Josiah's reign. "When a prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken."²

¹ *Numb* xl 29

² *Deut* xviii 22

Test for yourselves, by the principle enshrined in, this criterion, whether the prophets whose literary work is preserved in the Old Testament were indeed inspired by the "Spirit" or whether they were deluded. If you will do that, you will, in the course of your reading, discover for yourselves, in the prophet's own words, the "fruits of the Spirit," the truths of eternal value which the "Spirit" revealed first of all to Israel through these spirit-inspired men. And if you do so intelligently and in the light of modern scholarship, you will observe that, as in Judaism itself, you are confronted by no patchwork of ideas, no chaotic mass of conflicting notions or beliefs, poured out in confusion, lacking order and co-ordination. No. You will find the 9th and 8th century prophets attempting indeed to direct their country's policy aright in regard to external and internal political and social problems, but while doing so giving to the world a gradual and progressive revelation of great truths, for instance in regard to God, His righteousness, loving-kindness, holiness, those eternal values in any conception of the Divine character. You will find Isaiah¹ in particular almost committing himself to that which only the Son of God Himself fully revealed namely that God is "Spirit." You will see the "Spirit" well nigh incarnate in Jeremiah's life of intimate fellowship with the God of the "Spirit"; you will find him enunciating his doctrine of the New Covenant written in men's hearts; teaching which, in itself, presupposes no religion of external ordinances, but one of a spiritual order, the presence of God as "Spirit" in the inmost being of each individual.

You will find that Ezekiel was not so immersed in the details of the cultus as to be unable frankly to confess his consciousness of the "Spirit's" entrance

¹ Is. xxxi. 8.

into himself.¹ As it seemed to him, his own inspiration by the "Spirit" was inaugurated and mediated, not by "a live coal from off the altar,"² not by "the hand"³ of Jehovah, but through spirit-inspired literature. He visualized the reanimation of the dead bones of the nation as the actual re-entry into them of the same "Spirit." That "Spirit" was, in Ezekiel's estimation, all-pervading, as is shown by ch. i. 12 and by the fact that it is summoned for this specific purpose from the four winds or "Spirits" of heaven:—"Then said He unto me, Prophesy unto the Spirit, prophesy, son of man, and say to the Spirit, Thus saith Jehovah: Come from the four Spirits, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live."⁴ The "new Spirit" to "be put" in the new Israel⁵ is clearly itself Jehovah's own Spirit."⁶ I stress this because some who dislike Ezekiel's other terminology often fail to realize not only the fulness of the "Spirit's" inspiration of Ezekiel, but also the explicit character of Ezekiel's teaching in regard to the "Spirit."

You will notice next that the Deutero-Isaiah, at the close of the exile, showed an increasing interest in the "Spirit" itself, e.g., "Who hath directed the 'Spirit' of Jehovah, or being His counsellor hath taught Him,"⁷ or, tending still more clearly to differentiate between Jehovah and His "Spirit," "And now Jehovah God hath sent me, and His 'Spirit.'"⁸ So too Trito-Isaiah wrote: "They rebelled, and grieved His Holy 'Spirit.'"⁹ But the expression

¹ Ez. ii. 2; iii. 2, 24. See also above

² Is. vi. 6.

³ Jer. i. 9.

⁴ Ez. xxxvii. 9.

⁵ Ez. xi. 10; xviii. 31.

⁶ Ez. xxxvi. 26, 27.

⁷ Is. xl. 13.

⁸ Is. xlviii. 16.

⁹ Is. lxiii. 10a.

"Holy Spirit," so familiar to us, though comparatively rare in Jewish writings, does not, I need scarcely state, in itself suggest personality at all.

It was now, or soon after, that the Priestly School gave its *imprimatur* to the doctrine of the "Spirit's" agency even in the process of creation: "the 'Spirit' of God brooded over the surface of the waters." In the Apocrypha we find several interesting contributions to this thought as, for example, in Judith: "Thou didst send forth Thy 'Spirit,' and it builded them," as well as in passages in the Book of Wisdom to which I shall refer presently. *Baruch* xxi. 4 seems to regard the "Spirit" as an almost *personal* agent or mediator in creation: "Thou hast established the heights of heaven through Thy 'Spirit.'" A late Psalmist is no less emphatic as to the "Spirit's" omnipresence in the universe thus created: "Whither shall I go from Thy 'Spirit'? Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?"

to breath as its cause, can also perform. We find evidences of this idea in Egypt and in Babylonia; we find it too in the Old Testament in this primitive form: "By the 'Word' of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth."¹ Consequently the Alexandrine Jew, when he came into contact with Greek ideas of the *Logos* and with Stoic conceptions of the *anima mundi*, was sometimes inclined to prefer the "Logos," the "Word," to the "Spirit" conception as being the medium which, in his estimation, best and most usefully symbolized the action of the Divine in the Universe and in humanity. But even Philo, keen champion, as he was, of the "Word" conception, did not seek entirely to banish the "Spirit" terminology: on the contrary the "Spirit," though infrequently appearing in his writings, is in Philo's system "ontologically the same as the Logos, though in its higher sense it is used only of the Logos in connection with mankind."²

(2). We have already noticed that "wisdom" was regarded as one of the fruits of the "Spirit."³ But "Wisdom," when full grown, tended in certain circles of post-exilic Judaism to usurp to herself, as we have just seen that the Logos did in Philo, the functions ascribed in earlier days to her own first cause, "Spirit." Thus "Wisdom" was sometimes personified, as in Ben Sirach, or well nigh hypostatized, as in *Proverbs* viii, or a middle position was adopted and thought hovered between more poetical personification and actual hypostatization. Even the writer, whose work, because of his exposition of "Wisdom," is known as "The Book of Wisdom," realized the vital omnipotence and the real omni-

¹ Ps. xxxiii, 6. Cf. *II Sam.* xxiii, 2. *Is.* xxxiv, 16.

² Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, vol. II, p. 217.

³ *Is.* xi, 2.

presence of the "Spirit"; "because the 'Spirit' of the Lord hath filled the world, and that which holdeth all things together hath knowledge of every voice,"¹ or, as he stated in a later chapter, "Because Thine incorruptible 'Spirit' is in all things."² Just as he identified the "Word" and "Wisdom,"³ so too, even in describing "Wisdom" herself, he felt constrained to identify her with "Spirit," or at least to describe her as containing "Spirit," and as being on this very account, the origin of all Goodness, Righteousness, Cleverness, Beauty and Love:—

"For there is in her 'Spirit' quick of understanding, holy,
Alone in kind, manifold,
Subtil, freely moving,
Clear in utterance, unpolluted,
Distinct, unharmed,
Loving what is good, keen, unhindered,
Beneficent, loving toward man,
Stedfast, sure, free from care,
All-powerful, all-surveying,
And penetrating into the 'spirits' of all men."⁴

¹ *Wisdom* i. 7.

² *Wisdom* xii. 1.

³ e.g. *Wisdom* ix. 1, 2

⁴ *Wisdom* vii. 22b, 23.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT: (b) IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND ACTS

(ii) By Rev. A. H. McNEILE, D.D.,

*Regius Professor of Divinity in
the University of Dublin.*

OUR Lord was a Galilean, and all His first disciples were Galileans, or Jews of other parts of Palestine. And their thoughts on the nature of the Holy Spirit's action were necessarily conditioned by their national past. In far off days that action was scarcely distinguishable from the effects of a wind, which lighted upon an individual man here and there, or was poured upon him, or swept through him, impelling him to martial prowess or to ecstasy. As the nation grew out of its childhood the higher minds were able to discern spiritual things more spiritually. They rose above the almost material conceptions of earlier days; but with hardly an exception they felt the inspiration of God as something external to themselves, which came upon them, rested upon them, carried them along, they were filled with it, they were wrapped in it, so that they uttered messages which were not their own, and performed actions which they could not otherwise have performed. There is very little sign in the Old Testament that men had begun to realize, much less formulate, the truth of God's indwelling; I will not say immanence, because that is a philosophical conception quite foreign to their ways of thinking. God was a transcendent Being, separate from man; and His Spirit necessarily came upon man from the outside.

The ultimate fact in the philosophy of Christianity

is that the transcendent God is immanent. But the synoptic narratives—in which, as a matter of fact, the Divine Spirit is very seldom mentioned—never leave the plane of the Old Testament. In most cases the Spirit is not spoken of as acting in a personal matter, it is an effluence from God, a divine influence on man, a divine afflatus, a divine energy, without the article. St. Luke relates the words of the angel that John the Baptist would be filled with “holy spirit” from his mother’s womb, i.e., he would be an inspired prophet. Elizabeth was filled with “holy spirit” when with prophetic insight she cried her Ave Maria, and Zacharias when, as a prophet, he poured forth the words of the Benedictus. Of Simeon it is said that “holy spirit” was upon him. And when John came, heralding one mightier than he, he declared that He would baptize with ‘holy spirit’. The power of the Highest was to overshadow her that was highly favoured, and, according to the angel’s words, “holy spirit” shall come upon thee: the impact of God’s spiritual energy would make her capable of performing her unique function in history.

There were occasions when the definite form was necessary. Simeon, like Old Testament prophets, received an oracular message conveyed to him, as St. Luke says, ‘by the Holy Spirit’. Our Lord at His Baptism saw the Spirit descending like a dove upon Him, and the other Gospels similarly. Immediately afterwards St. Mark says that He was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness, though St. Luke is more careful to relate it impersonally: “Jesus being full of holy spirit returned from the Jordan,” and was led in that spirit, wrapped, enveloped in it, wandering about breathing the atmosphere of that tremendous effluence, or influence, or afflatus which had flooded Him. But in not a single instance do any of the synoptists intend to

express the maturer thought of the personal Spirit of God, the third Person of the sacred Trinity. Try the effect of translating the word *pneuma* throughout, not by "Spirit" but by "afflatus"—remembering, of course, that it is the afflatus of God Himself—and you will get very near to the thought of the evangelists.

It is a far cry from this to the developed conceptions of St Paul and St John. There is a wide difference between Jews in the days of our Lord and St Paul after Pentecost, when he had had time, filled as he was himself with the new inspiration, to dig deeply into what it meant for men. It is worth while to notice it for this reason, that it helps to enhance the value of the synoptic narratives as trustworthy records. It must be remembered that all three Gospels in their present form were written later than St Paul's death, when much of his interpretation of the things of God must have become fairly widely known. St Mark probably wrote soon after his death, at Rome where he died, and St Luke had been his companion. If he had read scarcely any of his epistles, perhaps none, when he wrote the Third Gospel, he must at least have heard him preach and talk. But they so faithfully incorporated their early written sources and oral traditions that, whatever may be said about the order of their narratives, and their details of time and place, they did preserve, to a wonderful extent, the state of mind and thought and feeling, the moral and intellectual atmosphere, of the time just before our Lord's death and resurrection and Pentecost, that compound cataclysmic event which divided all history into two.

We find the same when we study the words which they ascribe to Him. If their narratives contain very little of the nature and work of the Spirit, there is still less in the utterances of Jesus. All three

Gospels have the saying about blasphemy against the Spirit as contrasted with blasphemy against men, or the Son of Man; but there is no indication of the Spirit's nature or mode of working, except that it was the divine power in which, or in whom, He cast out demons. This indefiniteness of the words, as the synoptists record them, is further illustrated by His saying which occurs just before. In St. Matthew it takes the form, "If in the Spirit of God I cast out demons"; but St. Luke, who is generally more ready to speak of the Spirit than the others, writes, "If with the Finger of God I cast out demons." It is doubtful, therefore, whether our Lord said "Spirit"; but if He did, it must have had a meaning not very different from "Finger," God's power, energy, force, exerted from without, taking hold of, and enabling the human Instrument to do the work. Conversely, in another passage where they differ, it is St. Luke that has the word "Spirit." In the Sermon on the Mount St. Matthew writes, "how much rather shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him." St. Luke in his sermon has "holy spirit," without the article, instead of "good things." St. Matthew seems to include the supply of good things in the physical sphere; but if our Lord meant only spiritual blessings, He certainly did not speak of the personal Holy Spirit. God will give His *afflatus*, His spiritual endowment, enrichment, bounty, poured out for particular needs upon particular persons in answer to their prayer. One passage is placed by the three evangelists in three different positions. In St. Mark's apocalypse, in ch. xiii, the disciples are bidden not to be anxious beforehand about their defence when they are delivered up before kings, "for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit." In St. Matthew it is in the collected material in ch. x which makes

express the maturer thought of the personal Spirit of God, the third Person of the sacred Trinity. Try the effect of translating the word *pneuma* throughout, not by "Spirit" but by "afflatus"—remembering, of course, that it is the afflatus of God Himself—and you will get very near to the thought of the evangelists.

It is a far cry from this to the developed conceptions of St. Paul and St. John. There is a wide difference between Jews in the days of our Lord and St. Paul after Pentecost, when he had had time, filled as he was himself with the new inspiration, to dig deeply into what it meant for men. It is worth while to notice it for this reason, that it helps to enhance the value of the synoptic narratives as trustworthy records. It must be remembered that all three Gospels in their present form were written later than St. Paul's death, when much of his interpretation of the things of God must have become fairly widely known. St. Mark probably wrote soon after his death, at Rome where he died, and St. Luke had been his companion. If he had read scarcely any of his epistles, perhaps none, when he wrote the Third Gospel, he must at least have heard him preach and talk. But they so faithfully incorporated their

different from the Christian's, St John's words answer us, "The Spirit was not yet." The event had not yet occurred which was to divide history into two. We cross the watershed, and we find ourselves in a different region. We feel as travellers who pass from the Swiss to the Italian side of the Alps. The former is full of beauty, and lit by the same sun; but we think of the latter as the sunny side, steeped in the warmth which fosters luxuriant growth, glowing in light and colour, redolent with the fragrance of tree and flower.

One of the highest hopes of Israel's prophets had been that the *afflatus* which then swept upon particular persons here and there for particular purposes, would one day sweep upon all with a universal flood. And the event for which they yearned came at last. At Pentecost St Peter realized that Joel's words had found fulfilment, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh," your young men and old men, your servants and handmaids. It was not a Christian here and there, the true Israel as a whole was smitten with the divine gale. Notice that in the experience of Pentecost men's thoughts were not at once carried to any more advanced conception of the nature of the Spirit of God. It was still an external power, force, energy, which came from on high and fell on them. The visitation of God was experienced as something so much from the outside that it took for them the form of the shaking of the house, of hurricane, and flashing fire upon each of them, so that the immediate effects were seen in tongues and prophecy. Not, of course, that those were its only effects, it resulted in the inspired preaching of the apostles, by which the Lord added to the Church daily such as were being saved. But the *afflatus* was something which, as St Luke says, was given, they received it, or it came

up the missionary commission to the Twelve: "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." St. Luke's parallel to St. Mark has, "I will give you a mouth and wisdom," which certainly cannot be the original form of the words. But a similar saying seems to have occurred also in Q, and St. Luke places it to follow that on blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. It was again a special endowment, like that of a prophet, for a special need. The only other passages in which the word is ascribed to our Lord are definite references to the Old Testament. In St. Mark the Psalter is quoted with the formula, "David himself said in the Holy Spirit," i.e., speaking with prophetic inspiration. In St. Matthew it is, "How then does David in spirit call Him Lord?" ; while St. Luke has merely, "David saith in the book of Psalms." The remaining passage, given in St. Luke only, is our Lord's application to Himself of the prophet's words in Is. lxi: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me," which is referred to by St. Peter in Acts x.

We gather, then, that our Lord very seldom mentioned the Spirit. Only five distinct sayings have been handed down, and some of them are doubtful. But in none of them is the doctrine in advance of the Old Testament. We must realize the element of truth in Wellhausen's reminder that "Jesus was not a Christian, He was a Jew." And, as I say, the evangelists were faithful enough to their sources to preserve, both in His words and their narratives, the mental atmosphere of the time. Gregory of Nazianzus, in opposition to the Macedonians, still found it necessary to account for the reticence of Scripture on the Godhead of the Holy Spirit.

When we ask why the mental atmosphere was so

different from the Christian's, St John's words answer us, "The Spirit was not yet" The event had not yet occurred which was to divide history into two We cross the watershed, and we find ourselves in a different region We feel as travellers who pass from the Swiss to the Italian side of the Alps The former is full of beauty, and lit by the same sun, but we think of the latter as the sunny side, steeped in the warmth which fosters luxuriant growth, glowing in light and colour, redolent with the fragrance of tree and flower

One of the highest hopes of Israel's prophets had been that the *afflatus* which then swept upon particular persons here and there for particular purposes, would one day sweep upon all with a universal flood And the event for which they yearned came at last At Pentecost St Peter realized that Joel's words had found fulfilment, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh," your young men and old men, your servants and handmaids It was not a Christian here and there, the true Israel as a whole was smitten with the divine gale Notice that in the experience of Pentecost men's thoughts were not at once carried to any more advanced conception of the nature of the Spirit of God. It was still an external power, force, energy, which came from on high and fell on them The visitation of God was experienced as something so much from the outside that it took for them the form of the shaking of the house, of hurricane, and flashing fire upon each of them, so that the immediate effects were seen in tongues and prophecy Not, of course, that those were its only effects, it resulted in the inspired preaching of the apostles, by which the Lord added to the Church daily such as were being saved But the *afflatus* was something which, as St Luke says, was given, they received it, or it came

upon them, it was poured out upon them, they were baptized in it, they were filled with it—the whole Church, one spirit-filled body.

A further result was that as souls were added to the Church daily, the hurricane of spiritual energy smote them also. As yet it had fallen upon none of the Samaritans, but Peter and John laid their hands upon them, and the holy afflatus came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. At Cæsarea the holy afflatus fell on all those that heard St. Peter preaching. And his Jewish companions were astonished that upon the Gentiles also the gift of the holy afflatus had been poured out; for they heard them speaking with tongues. As he said afterwards, "The holy afflatus fell on them, as on us at the beginning." And "in the paraclesis—the encouragement, the exhilaration—of the Holy Spirit (St. Luke says) the Church was multiplied." In many of these cases the word *pneuma* has no article; they were filled with holy inspiration. But even with the article it often means simply "the inspiration," "the afflatus," which was already the possession of the Church. Only once does St. Luke relate a fresh outpouring, or inpouring, on one who had already received it; he says it of St. Paul when he rebuked Elymas the sorcerer.

But yet another result of great importance is frequently spoken of. The inspiration did not take only the outward form of tongues and prophecy and preaching. We are told of a heightening, an illuminating, of their mental powers, an intuition, a prevision, of particular persons at particular moments, which they accepted as the very message of God to their souls. It was still due to His inspiration or afflatus; but because the message came from Him, the action of His *pneuma* could not be related impersonally; and language is used which shews

how the mind of the Church was feeling its way, not by any metaphysical speculation, but by the experience of daily life, towards the truth of the personality of the Holy Spirit "The Spirit said to Philip, Go and join thyself to this chariot" "The Spirit said" to Peter that two men were seeking him, and that he was to go with them And he related the same afterwards "The Spirit said, Separate Me, Barnabas and Saul" And "sent forth by the Holy Spirit they went down to Seleucia" St Paul and his party were forbidden by the Holy Spirit to preach the word in Asia "They assayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not" "The Spirit testifieth in every city, saying unto me that bonds and afflictions await me" And Agabus said, "These things saith the Holy Spirit, The man whose girdle this is shall the Jews bind in Jerusalem" Twice this form of expression is used with regard to the inspiration of writers in the Old Testament St Peter at the very beginning said, "The Scripture was of necessity fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David concerning Judas" And St Paul at the very end said "Well spake the Holy Spirit through Isaiah the prophet" The highest point in the development of the thought is seen in St Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit hath appointed you as overseers" But there are two passages which contain perhaps the most striking, we might almost say dramatic, expression of the feeling that the Spirit was not only an afflatus, but the mind of God Himself working in co operation with them St Peter said to the Sanhedrin, "We are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Spirit which God gave to them that obey Him" We can feel that St Luke did not quite mean "the Holy Spirit whom

God gave," and yet that which God gave was a joint-witness St Peter said this to the Jewish council And the Christian council, in Ch. xv, solemnly prefaced its decrees with the words, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us"

But when we have said all this, there is still another aspect of it which needs to be pondered Nearly everything that we have noticed is to all intents and purposes Jewish, scarcely a word of it is incompatible with a Unitarian conception of God Is there nothing more which suggests the Christian conception? It used to be an axiom with biologists that "Nature does nothing by jumps," which is now held to be untrue When we pass to St Paul's epistles we certainly find a great jump in the evolution of Christian doctrine But that never means that the plant or species can proceed independently of the root or germ St Paul does not produce from his imagination something wholly new in kind, on a completely different plane from earlier Christian thought and tradition

All the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out amongst them, His influence was gradually dominating and moulding their souls Some of His conversations as He walked over the country or sat at meals, some of the occasions on which they found Him praying *sometimes His look and manner*, His whole Self, must have caught their hearts with a sudden grip and shock and thrill, I can imagine their hero-worship *sometimes possessing them afresh* with a new rush of feeling too deep for words The daily, constant impact and magnetism of His spirit on theirs must sometimes have touched and shaken them, at moments when respect deepened into awe, and the affection of pupils into the self abandonment of personal devotion

And when the time came that the Spirit was

poured upon them from on high, they said to themselves, Jesus is on high, this is the same thing that we used to feel of old, though we did not understand it; it is the same divine afflatus that used to sweep and flood us, and make our hearts burn within us "Thus Jesus . . . being exalted at the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, hath poured forth this which ye hear and see" The Spirit of God is the Spirit which Jesus has sent us From the moment of Pentecost they began to baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus, because to become members of the Spirit filled Body, to be baptized in the Spirit, was to partake in the outpouring of that which was sent by Jesus So that, as we have seen, when St. Paul and his party tried to go into Bithynia, St. Luke could say quite simply, according to the true reading, "The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not"

Experience, therefore, taught them, not only that the Spirit of God acted upon the soul in such a way that they felt obliged to speak of It in a personal manner, but that the Spirit of God was, in fact, the Spirit of their Master exalted to God's right hand Thus the Christian tradition which St Paul received contained an abundant nucleus from which great things could grow What he did, and the Johannine mystic after him, was not to arrive at anything radically new Their work in the growth of the Church's doctrine was something akin to what Prof Otto calls "schematization" The inrush of the divine thing that was 'given,' the super earthly enrichment experienced by the first apostles and by the average Christian, without reason or explanation, was shewn to have its true place in the divine scheme St Paul was chiefly concerned with its place in the economy of divine salvation, St John with its implications as to the Nature of God St

Paul dealt with the psychology of the Spirit, St. John with the theology. But the personal experience of the disciples during the few months before, and the few years after, our Lord's death and resurrection supplied the material which two inspired thinkers used, in building up the fabric of which the creeds were the coping-stone.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT (b) IN THE
EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL AND IN
THE WRITINGS OF ST. JOHN

(iii) By REV SIR EDWIN C HOSKYNs, Bt, M A, M C,
Fellow, Dean, and Librarian
of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

THE opening paragraph of William Law's *Humble, Earnest and Affectionate Address to the Clergy* contains a passage which not only assigns to the Church its especial function in human society, but also provides a concise summary of the teaching of the New Testament in general, and of the writings of St Paul and St John in particular "I would not," he writes, "turn my own thoughts or call the attention of Christians to anything but the one thing needful, the one thing essential and only available to our rising out of our fallen state, and becoming as we were at our creation, an holy offspring of God and real partakers of the Divine Nature If it be asked What this one thing is? It is the Spirit of God brought again to His first power of life in us Nothing else is wanted by us, nothing else intended for us, by the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel Nothing else is, or can be, effectual to the making sinful man become again a godly creature Everything else, be it what it will, however glorious and Divine in outward appearance, everything that angels, men, churches, or reformations can do for us is dead or helpless, but so far as it is the immediate work of the Spirit of God breathing and living in it " These words were addressed to the Clergy of the Church of England 150 years ago

Primitive Christianity was primarily not a doctrine about God, not a society organized to proclaim a Gospel or follow a hero, not a promise of immortality, not a means of achieving a mystical experience or developing human personality. Primarily, Christianity was an organism, a family, a race, a people, a nation, moved by a power which could neither be entirely controlled nor completely understood, which took hold of men and women, bound them together, and separated them from all, whether Jew, Greek, or barbarian, who had not been moved in like manner. The distinction between the Church and the World, whether thus expressed or not, was the essence of the Christian religion before St. Paul and St. John gave it classic expression. The Christians felt themselves to be one visible community of men and women energized and transfused by the Holy Spirit of God, a *New Creation* (Gal. vi. 15), *one Body and one Spirit* (Eph. iv. 4). This unity or fellowship in the Spirit was something mysteriously given, not laboriously attained; but once given its permanence was not magically guaranteed, and for this reason St. Paul was compelled to exhort the Ephesian Christians *to strive to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace* (iv. 3).

The whole complex activity of the Christian Ecclesia was love, joy, peace, as an organism, the organic concretion of the Holy Spirit of God. The modern antithesis between Spirit and body or Spirit and matter could, therefore, find no place in the thought or experience of the primitive Christians. Bread, wine, water, the bodies of the Christians, were taken up, used and transformed in the Spiritual worship or service of God. *The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and Truth, for such doth the Father*

seek to be His worshippers God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth (John iv 23, 24) The context in which these words occur makes it quite clear that no contrast is suggested between a spiritual and a material worship. The contrast which the writer intends to emphasize is the contrast between the Samaritan or the Jewish worship of God and the Christian worship of God. The latter is the true and spiritual worship, the former the false or incomplete worship. Divorced from the power of the Spirit flesh is but flesh, matter but matter, but when submitted to the Spirit of God it becomes itself spiritual. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth the flesh profiteth nothing (John vi 68)* Christianity was, therefore, not a disposition of mind, not a way of thinking, or a sentiment or feeling, not a programme of political or social reform. It was rather the concretion of the Spirit of God, in which flesh and blood were taken up into the service of God and glorified.

This embodiment of the Holy Spirit of God in a living concrete organism must, however, not be so described as to deprive the individual either of his freedom or of his significance, nor must the organism as a whole control the picture of primitive Christianity to such an extent as to rob the local ecclesia in any given city either of its independence or of its perfection as a complete entity. St Paul, it is true, can compare the individual Christian with a stone in a growing building, or with a plant in a garden, or with a limb of a body, and he can also think of the local churches as parts of the whole. But this is but one aspect of St Paul's thought. In other passages he writes of the part as a whole, or of the whole residing in the part. The Church in Corinth, for example, is a concrete whole, the complete activity of the Spirit in Corinth, not of a fraction of the Spirit.

Similarly, he speaks of the individual Christian not only as a stone in a temple, but as himself the temple of the Holy Spirit. The moment of the conversion of the individual, that is of the free recognition and acceptance of the will of God as a paramount demand made by the living God to the heart of the believer, is also the moment of the advent of the Spirit of God and, therefore of the transformation of the whole man, body and soul, from sin to righteousness. And yet St Paul is conscious of no opposition between the individual and the local church or between the local church and the Ecclesia of God except in so far as the power of sin re enters and destroys the work of the Holy Spirit.

Nor is it otherwise in the writings of St John. The Christian community is compared to a vine complete with its fruit and its branches, to a perfect catch of a perfect number of fishes, to a flock of sheep and lambs, freed from a cramped and narrow fold, led out into a new pasturage and cared for by the good Shepherd of the sheep and by His authorized deputy. The whole imagery is summed up in the scene where the disciples as a body are re-created by the inbreathing of the Spirit of God. The language echoes the narrative of the creation of Adam in the LXX version of the first chapter of Genesis. And yet, in spite of all this vigorous imagery, the Fourth Gospel presents a series of individuals re-created re born and enlivened—the lame man at the pool of Siloam the man born blind Lazarus and above all, the Beloved Disciple who received the Spirit breathed out upon him by the dying Christ. Similarly, also the three Johannine Epistles are addressed to the whole Ecclesia, to a local church, and to an individual. But all are Catholic Epistles all contain the same teaching because the essential nature, and consequently the problems, of a local church or of a

particular individual are those of the whole Ecclesia, and for this reason the whole can be seen and addressed in the individual Christian or in the local church.

The organic unity of the Ecclesia of God, therefore, does not have the effect of robbing the local church of its independence, or of depriving the individual of his significance.

When once the concretion of the Holy Spirit of God in a living organism is recognized as the essence of primitive Christianity, we are freed from a widespread misunderstanding which has tended to obscure the nature of the Christian Religion by applying modern political ideals to the Ecclesia of God. Primitive Christianity was not democratic. It was a religion of authority, and obedience was the persistent note which echoes through the Christian literature of the first century. The Christians felt that they lived, as they had been called, under the direct authority of God. But this was no abstract authority. It was the authority of the Spirit of God acting in the Community, and through the ministry. The saints, the ordinary Christians, lived in obedience to the Gospel not as an abstract teaching, but as proclaimed by prophets, teachers, evangelists, presbyters, *episcopoi*, and apostles. But this devastating chain of authority was neither felt to be burdensome, nor was it regarded as human. It was the authority of the Spirit of God. Nor did it tamper with the sense of freedom, since freedom was attained through absolute submission to the will of God, not political freedom, but freedom from sin, the peculiar freedom of the Children of God. Freedom not equality was the gift of God to the Christians.

Theocracy, therefore, not democracy, was the essence of Christian polity; that is to say the rule of God through the activity of the Spirit. Nor have we any right to distinguish between the authority

of a charismatic ministry and that of an official ministry. All authority was felt to be charismatic, and in this the prophets did not differ from the presbyters or the *episcopoi*. For this reason the attempt to express the faith in terms of modern thought, whether political or scientific, is a most hazardous procedure, since the categories of modern thought have not emerged from, and do not serve to classify occasions of experience conditioned by the direct and immediate expression of the will of God. Similarly, in describing Primitive Christianity as it is reflected in the writings of St. Paul and St. John, we must beware of such phrases as "the development of personality" or "the highest good," which imply that Christianity was an element which effected a development in the individual, or was a good among other goods, even though it be the highest. To St. Paul and St. John such language would be definitely misleading, and would obscure the nature of Christian experience. Christianity did not effect a gradual development in moral or spiritual power. It was rather freedom from sin, catastrophic, perfect, creative. The problem which faced the Christian was not how to attain righteousness, but how to maintain it. Nor was complete submission to the will of God the crown of a series of good things, it was the only good. All that existed outside the known and personally experienced will of God was sin. Sin and righteousness, the Church and the World presented an absolute either-or; there was no third alternative, no *via media*.

Such was the Ecclesia of God, the home of the Holy Spirit, and the Sphere of His creative and manifold activity.

Hitherto, however, no reference has been made to the most characteristic feature of the Christian Ecclesia, for no explanation has been given why it

was the *Christian* Ecclesia That is to say, no differentiation has been made between the Spirit by whose power the universe was brought into being or who spake by the prophets, and the Spirit by whom the Christians were moved To all the writers of the books of the New Testament, of course, the Spirit is the same Spirit who moved the prophets and created the world, but this is not their most characteristic teaching St John can record, baldly and nakedly record, that until the Christ had offered Himself as the true Passover Lamb The Spirit was not yet and the variant reading—*was not yet given*—does not materially alter the sense of the passage A restless *not yet* controls the narrative in the Fourth Gospel until the moment when the dying Christ hands over the Spirit to the Beloved Disciple or when the risen Christ breathes the Spirit into His disciples and by that act creates the Ecclesia and empowers His disciples to continue His work Nor does St Paul for a moment suggest that the Ecclesia appeared suddenly in the world, caught, as it were, out of the air, without father or mother The work of the Spirit is precise, consistent, unified and effectual This effectual unity displayed concretely in the lives of the Christians is nowhere explained merely as a reproduction of the original creation in the microcosm of the Church or merely as a multiplication and extension of the experience of the Hebrew prophets It is wholly new, a *new creation*, and the emphasis is equally divided between the word *new* and the word *creation*

The precise, clearly defined, and effectual energy of the Holy Spirit is conditioned by the fact that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ *If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His* (Rom viii 9) In one passage St Paul quite openly writes *Now the Lord is the Spirit* (II Cor iii 17) The Church

is, therefore, no independent spiritual organism, it depends upon the Christ and is the extension of His work; similarly the life of the individual Christian in the Spirit is the formation in him of the Christ, as the Church, being the organism of the Spirit, is the Body of Christ. Thus the lineaments of the Spirit, if such a phrase be allowed, are the lineaments of the Christ incarnate. *In the Spirit* is to St. Paul a synonym for *in Christ*. The reproduction of the figure and stature of Christ in the Christian, in the local Church, and in the Ecclesia provides both St. Paul and St. John with a criterion of the genuine work of the Spirit of God. Since the *imitatio Christi* is essential, true religious experience is capable of being distinguished from false religiosity. Neither spiritual exaltation nor a deep stirring of the emotions are sufficient in themselves to indicate the presence of the Spirit of God; they are equally the work of the spirit of evil. Only the creative birth of righteousness and charity in the sinner assuredly betrays the work of the Spirit of God and of His Son Jesus Christ. *The fruit of the Spirit of love is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law, and they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof (Gal. v. 22).* These are necessary signs that men are led by the Spirit of God, and that they have in very truth been reborn from above of water and of the Spirit. In his first epistle St. John insists on the same criterion. Spiritual power is based upon the belief that Jesus Christ came in flesh, and he claims to know by experience that whenever the incarnate Christ is removed from the centre of a man's faith, there inevitably reappears immorality and hatred of the brethren; this is especially true of men who claim to have an abnormally acute insight into spiritual

truth. Hence his vigorous demand to *test the spirits whether they be of God*: because many false prophets have gone out into the world. *Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God; and this is the spirit of the antichrist.* (I John iv. 1. ff.). It is, therefore, impossible for St. John to divorce the Spirit from the Christ. The passage in which he speaks of the Spirit of Truth as *another Comforter*, is followed immediately by the words *I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you* (xiv. 18). The work of the Spirit is thus indestructibly linked to the work of the Christ. It is the glorification of the Christ (xvi. 14), bearing witness of Him (xv. 26), bringing to the remembrance of His disciples all that He had said unto them (xiv. 26). The advent of the Spirit is, therefore, the advent of the Christ, and in St. John's writings the eschatology consequently tends to be driven into the background, and the incarnation of the Word precedes the concretion of the Spirit in the Christian community but in such a manner that the two form together one indissoluble whole.

The precision of the work of the Spirit thus depends upon the relation between the Spirit and the Christ; the clear recognition of this by all the writers of the New Testament explains their insistence that the coming of the Spirit involves the *imitatio Christi*. St. Paul and St. John, however, state in the clearest possible terms that the work of the Spirit is not merely precise but effectual. It is, therefore, necessary to examine closely the grounds of the effectual power of the Spirit in turning men from sin to righteousness, and in effecting the new birth of the children of God. At this point a new factor emerges. The effectual working of the Spirit is never thought of as due

merely to the innate power of the Spirit, and important and fundamental as the *imitatio Christi* is, it is itself from this point of view secondary. The effectual working of the Spirit of God is derived from the death of Christ, the perfect sacrifice and oblation for the sins of the world. The gospel was, therefore, primarily the proclamation both in word and in ritual acts of Christ crucified. *While we were yet sinners*, writes St. Paul, *Christ died for us* (Rom. v. 8). *Ye were brought with a price* (I Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23). *O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was placarded crucified?* This only would I learn from you, *Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law or by the hearing of faith* (Gal. iii. 1).

For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death, till He come (I Cor. xi. 26). It was, therefore, not merely the life of the Christ, but pre-eminently His death which made possible the effectual working of the Spirit. This is the meaning of St. John's *The Spirit was not yet*, that is, not until the sacrifice had been perfected, and the Lord had uttered the significant words *It is finished*. Quite consistently, therefore, St. John defers the handing over of the Spirit to the Beloved Disciple and to the eleven disciples until the sacrifice has been made, and quite naturally he associates the outpouring of the Spirit with the outpouring of the water and the blood from the side of the crucified Christ. This almost certainly is symbolical writing, but it is essentially Christian symbolism. *There are three who bear witness, the Spirit and the water and the blood and the three agree in one* (I John v. 8). The language is undeniably difficult, but its general meaning is not obscure. Moral purification and new life, in fact the whole effectual working of the Spirit, are conditioned by the sacrificial death of the Christ.

This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and the blood (1 John v. 6). The victory of the believer over the power of sin is, it is true, the *imitatio Christi* in the power of the Spirit; but behind the *imitatio Christi* lies the death of the Christ, which alone renders the imitation possible. *Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world* (John xvi. 33); *If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world* (1 John ii. 1 f.). *He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself to walk even as He walked.* The *imitatio Christi* forms therefore an element in that sacrificial terminology which underlies the writings both of St. Paul and St. John. We have no right to detach the *imitatio Christi* from its sacrificial framework, not at any rate if our object is to understand primitive Christianity.

The death of Christ is for St. John the judgment of the prince of this world, and he therefore states that the work of the Spirit consists in pointing back to the death of the Christ and assigning to it redemptive significance: *And He, the Spirit, when He is come, will convince the world of judgment . . . of judgment because the prince of this world hath been judged.*

All true and spiritual Christian worship thus consists in proclaiming the Lord's death till He come, and in assigning to it redemptive significance as the Lord himself had done at the Last Supper, confident in the belief that both the *imitatio Christi* and the hope of immortality are there involved. This is the prime function of the Ecclesia of God in the world. All else is a by-product, though it is not unreasonable to expect that just in so far as the Church stands in the world as the Body of Christ convincing the world

of sin and righteousness and judgment, so far will it contribute to the welfare of human society

Till He come The effectual working of the Spirit of God and of Christ in the Christian Ecclesia remains still as St Paul says, but *an earnest of the Spirit which is to be* This is the tragedy of the Christian Religion The hope remains still a hope Each Eucharist is still an exhortation to take up the cross to pray that we may be delivered from the power of evil to believe in God We still see Him only through a glass darkly, and we still know but in part The work of the Spirit must still be tested by charity and by righteousness not by knowledge nor by the vision of God The Church remains in the world though not of it The work of the Spirit is still incomplete

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT (c) IN THEOLOGY

(1) Rev G E NEWSOM, M A ,

*Vicar of Newcastle and Canon Residentiary
of the Cathedral*

My subject is the *Eternal Spirit in Theology*, and we are invited in this half hour to think of the ' reality ' and ' universal significance ' of the Spirit. We are to avoid " details of technical theology " Our task therefore, is to think over an aspect of religious life and to link our thought with other more general thought about human life and religion. Theology means thinking about God and all things together. I should be glad to do so in such a way as to help a few of the people who to day are keen to reflect upon the deeper and larger meaning of life, but regard Theology as being out of touch with modern interpretations of life.

I take it that my task has certain strict limitations and you will not expect me to speak about the Holy Spirit in the Church or about mysticism. What I shall attempt may be described as one chapter in the theological approach to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. At the same time I hope that what is said will not seem entirely remote from life. There is a touching story in von Hügel about a young officer who gave up his life for an older man in the Boer War. The older man said to him " What a pity ! You who have all your life before you to die for me who am near the end of mine " " Pity," replied the boy, " not at all. Nothing could be better " In such a way as this, says von Hügel, the Supernatural actually comes into our ordinary human life. I venture to

add that the heroic self forgetfulness and devotion of the boy to a noble action was the work of the Holy Spirit and that in discussing this work we must be careful not to exclude any sort of life or action which is manifestly governed by self forgetful obedience to a vision of Perfection

VENI CREATOR

What do we Christians mean by the work of the Holy Spirit? The best reply would be to recite our English translation of the *Veni Creator*, which is alive with ideas of universal significance drawn from the theology of the Fourth Gospel a Gospel written to link up the Faith with the best thought of that day. In this hymn the work of the Spirit is described as 'enabling the soul' by "inspiring" it with the Life, Light and Love which are in God, in order that life may be a 'song of praise' to the "Eternal Merit", or to use a modern and less legal term to the "Absolute Value" of the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is invoked to effect a spiritual transformation of the soul by filling it with the values of the Life Eternal.

THE HOLY

Thus the creative work of the Holy Spirit. It is a curious fact that neither in the English nor in the Latin version of the hymn does the word "holy" appear except just at the end and then only in the title of the Blessed Spirit. Nevertheless it is essential that we should consider what we mean by this word "Holy". We are faced by a choice. Either we take our bearings from the New Testament or, as Dr. Otto seems to suggest, from speculations upon the nebulous data of primitive religion. What does the New Testament mean by holiness? I think there is little doubt

It means an ethical quality of character whether in God or man. It is not something foreign to the human conscience and reason. The New Testament follows the Old in recording God's demand "Be ye holy, for I am holy." This is fundamental. Man, created in God's image, has the capacity for holiness. That is the essential ground of his kinship with God. Apart from this kinship the Gospel of Christ becomes an empty tale. But Dr. Otto says No—the real meaning of holiness is to be sought in the shuddering awe of the savage in the presence of the numinous, something with which man has and can have no kinship at all. The "holy" means the "inherently 'wholly other'."¹ God forbid that we should say a word to belittle the place of reverence and awe in His worship. God forbid also that we should belie the message of the Gospel that man, though for ever afar from the Absolute Perfection of God's holiness, may yet receive the very spirit and life breath of that holiness.

I cannot think that Dr. Otto has given due weight to the New Testament. Certainly in his book on *The Holy* he does not take his bearings from the New Testament. I speak with respect and gratitude for great thoughts in this book. But if lightly used, as some are using it, for the ordinary teaching of the Faith, this "numinous" will play upon the weaknesses of modern sensationalism and blow upon the ever smouldering embers of primitive superstition. Let us cherish the balanced wisdom of von Hugel. Our great Master emphasized with all his energy the truth that religion is concerned with a "Reality other and higher than our own," but emphasized no less that the perfect Reality is "sufficiently like us to be able to penetrate us and move us through and through" and "when accepted to bring to us light,

¹ Otto *The Idea of the Holy* p. 23

order and fruitfulness," a Reality to be adored, and ever with a holy fear, but a Reality not "wholly other" from our own

What do we mean then by Holiness whether in God or man? I believe we may seek help towards our answer from the modern philosophy of Value

We must not despise the philosophy of the day any more than it was despised by the ancient fathers of the Church who freely used the forms of Greek thought to elucidate for their own generation the meaning of Christ This philosophy of value has brought to many souls a large freedom of thought and a new conviction of the ultimate spiritual nature of the universe

The ultimate intrinsic values are Ideals which have their full reality only in the Eternal Life This Eternal Life is our true environment The values are forms of its Absolute Worthiness They are viewed as self communicative and creative Now it is possible to play with this philosophy and to have a dilettante belief in Truth and Goodness and Beauty But the values do not exist that they may appeal to our taste and liking any more than they exist to be utilized for any less purpose than their own The deep toned message of Kant is heard through this philosophy, the message of unconditional obligation The Eternal Values demand an absolute allegiance Kant may have worked too much with the Western idea of 'law' and have given some encouragement to a dry moralism But his insight has left its mark on all later thought Apart from Revelation he, more than any thinker, has revealed the essence of religion and secured the foundations of Theism He laid them in the Consciousness of the Ought, of unconditional obligation So in the Value philosophy the great typical Ideals of spiritual life are presented as coming with absolute authority Yet they come

not as law, but as life, the higher life and the higher self of all lives and of all selves, demanding the sacrifice of all lesser interests, and a devotion, at once bounden and free, solemn and glad. Accepted thus, they give to man's life a share of their own fruitfulness and blessedness. Holiness therefore is not one value among others. It is the free and yet bounden *devotion* to the values. It is one of the two fundamental forces of the spiritual life. For holiness means giving self to the *claims* of the Eternal Life and love means giving self to bring others into life giving touch with those absolute claims and values. There may be often a strain between the claims of Holiness and Love, just as there is between contemplation and action, between Individualism and Socialism, between the two great Commandments of the Christian law. In the life of Jesus Christ we see both these forces in a wonderful unity the perfect holiness of devotion to the Eternal Goodness and Truth, and the perfect love of a life given up to creative work in and for others. Holiness and Love, may they not be thought of as the two heart pulses, the systole and anastole, of the Eternal Life of God?

But, it may be said how can there be this kind of holiness in God? Is His life not *identical* with the Eternal Values? Well although we hesitate to say anything at all upon so ineffable a theme perhaps we may hazard one thought. As against theologians like Tertullian (and Calvin?) who taught that goodness is goodness and truth is truth because they are so decreed by the will of God it is I believe lawful and right to hold that God wills the good because it is good and the true because it is true. If this be so then in the Eternal I ife itself we seem to divine, not indeed a division as there is in man but a distinction between Will and the Values which are Ideals of the Will. On this assumption the Holiness of God is the

order and fruitfulness," a Reality to be adored, and ever with a holy fear, but a Reality not "wholly other" from our own

What do we mean then by Holiness whether in God or man? I believe we may seek help towards our answer from the modern philosophy of Value.

We must not despise the philosophy of the day any more than it was despised by the ancient fathers of the Church who freely used the forms of Greek thought to elucidate for their own generation the meaning of Christ. This philosophy of value has brought to many souls a large freedom of thought and a new conviction of the ultimate spiritual nature of the universe.

The ultimate intrinsic values are Ideals which have their full reality only in the Eternal Life. This Eternal Life is our true environment. The values are forms of its Absolute Worthiness. They are viewed as self communicative and creative. Now it is possible to play with this philosophy and to have a dilettante belief in Truth and Goodness and Beauty. But the values do not exist that they may appeal to our taste and liking any more than they exist to be utilized for any less purpose than their own. The deep toned message of Kant is heard through this philosophy, the message of unconditional obligation. The Eternal Values demand an absolute allegiance. Kant may have worked too much with the Western idea of "law" and have given some encouragement to a dry moralism. But his insight has left its mark on all later thought. Apart from Revelation he, more than any thinker, has revealed the essence of religion and secured the foundations of Theism. He laid them in the Consciousness of the Ought, of unconditional obligation. So in the Value philosophy the great typical Ideals of spiritual life are presented as coming with absolute authority. Yet they come

not as law, but as life, the higher life and the higher self of all lives and of all selves, demanding the sacrifice of all lesser interests, and a devotion, at once bounden and free, solemn and glad. Accepted thus, they give to man's life a share of their own fruitfulness and blessedness. Holiness therefore is not one value among others. It is the free and yet bounden devotion to the values. It is one of the two fundamental forces of the spiritual life. For holiness means giving self to the claims of the Eternal Life, and love means giving self to bring others into life giving touch with those absolute claims and values. There may be often a strain between the claims of Holiness and Love, just as there is between contemplation and action, between Individualism and Socialism, between the two great Commandments of the Christian law. In the life of Jesus Christ we see both these forces in a wonderful unity, the perfect holiness of devotion to the Eternal Goodness and Truth, and the perfect love of a life given up to creative work in and for others. Holiness and Love, may they not be thought of as the two heart pulses, the systole and anastole, of the Eternal Life of God?

But, it may be said, how can there be this kind of holiness in God? Is His life not identical with the Eternal Values? Well, although we hesitate to say anything at all upon so ineffable a theme, perhaps we may hazard one thought. As against theologians like Tertullian (and Calvin?) who taught that goodness is goodness and truth is truth because they are so decreed by the will of God, it is, I believe, lawful and right to hold that God wills the good because it is good and the true because it is true. If this be so then in the Eternal Life itself we seem to divine, not indeed a division as there is in man, but a distinction between Will and the Values which are Ideals of the Will. On this assumption the Holiness of God is the

perfect and absolute Unity of His devotion to the Eternal Values, victorious over every possible opposition or tension. In human life and character at the best we see a strong extensive power of loving and creative help and a strong intensive unity of holy loyalty to goodness and truth. From this analogy we dare to consider the distinction between the Eternal Word and the Eternal Holy Spirit of God.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

But before we turn to the distinction between the Word and the Spirit we must gather up in a few words the New Testament doctrine of the operation of the Holy Spirit. Let me be content to quote Dr. Swete's statement¹ of the New Testament teaching upon the personality of the Holy Spirit: "In His own nature it is impossible to doubt that He possesses that which answers in some higher and, to us, incomprehensible way to personality in man." And the same author's account of the Early Church doctrine of His relation to the Blessed Trinity: "The Holy Spirit is an eternally existing mode of the Being of God, and not a separate centre of consciousness and self-determination."² You will not expect me to follow out the later history of the doctrine, but will, I hope, let me make a few references to the New Testament doctrine of the function of the Holy Spirit.

According to the New Testament the operation of the Holy Spirit is directed upon the "inner man," the rational, ethical, and spiritual powers of the soul, giving life, renewal, transformation, so that Christ may dwell in the soul, that the soul may be filled with

¹ *Holy Spirit in N. T.*, p. 203.

² *Holy Spirit in Ancient Church*, p. 876.

heavenly truth and love, may be joined to the Sonship of Christ. The method of the Spirit's operation is to enable the soul to apprehend the supreme Value of Christ, to recognize the divine character of His life and work, to consecrate itself to Christ in utter devotion, and to co-operate in the redemptive work of God. In the Fourth Gospel the Spirit will "remind" the disciples of Christ, will "take of His and shew it to them," will bear witness of Him, so that they too shall bear witness. The work of the Holy Spirit as a whole is to bring the soul into a living correspondence with the manifestation of God. In *Ephesians* i. His ultimate task is, to quote the paraphrase of Dr. Swete, to bring about the "recognition by all God's creatures of His moral glory manifested in the completed history of Redemption."

From this rough summary it is clear that the work of the Holy Spirit is to quicken and consecrate the human spirit *for* something already given in manifestation, in brief *for* God as revealed in Christ. Perhaps we may say He convinces, consecrates and commissions. He convinces the heart and mind of the absolute value of the Eternal Life as seen in Christ. He consecrates the spiritual nature of man to offer as absolute a devotion. He commissions the converted soul so that it may share in the mission of the Spirit and go forth to strengthen the brethren. In St. Paul's teaching, consecration is one great centripetal movement towards Christ. But no manifestation of spiritual value is to be neglected. Whatsoever things are true, just, lovely, the values of Truth, Beauty and Goodness, all are to be revered. *There is nothing in the New Testament to prevent us from assuming a wide extension of the work of the Holy Spirit or from saying that wherever and whenever the soul responds to spiritual values with some dim sense of their intrinsic and universal and absolute*

claim—there is the hand of the Blessed Spirit the Sanctifier.

THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT.

There appears to be, therefore, in the New Testament amidst a great variety of ideas, one leading idea of the work of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God consecrates the spirit of man by imparting holiness; and holiness is the devotion of the whole spiritual nature to the Creative Values of Truth and Love as manifested above all in Jesus Christ.

But there are many writers to-day who declare that the New Testament identifies the Spirit with the Risen Christ. "The Lord is the Spirit." There is a measure of truth in this which we shall glance at in a moment. But let us first consider (what is no less clear in N.T.) the distinction between the work of the Logos and the work of the Spirit. If we accept, as I believe it is our wisdom to accept, the New Testament doctrine of the Eternal Logos or Self-expression of God, we have a far-reaching doctrine of Manifestation. There is a weakness in the philosophy of Value taken alone. It has no strong doctrine of manifestation. In the Hebrew-Christian tradition there is a unique doctrine of manifestation, viz:—that history is essentially a process through which God is working out a purpose. This purpose is to reveal the Eternal Life to the creature and to invite his response.

This is no mad dream. It receives support to-day from well-known interpreters of the doctrine of Evolution, not to mention the deeper interpreters of human history. The upward tendency of organic evolution, so Professor Sir Arthur Thomson declares, is towards Intelligence and Love, i.e. towards kinship

with the Eternal Values of Truth and Goodness And Beauty is manifest everywhere If these ideas about Nature are to be trusted, then we look back upon an amazing extension of "History" For not only will it include organic evolution, but also the foregoing development of the inorganic world as the suitable environment of life Modern science, therefore, provides us with many suggestions—we must not perhaps claim more—for filling out St Paul's teaching on the Great Expectation "The earnest expectation of the Creature waiteth for the manifestation of the Sons of God" And if man is to be true to his inheritance he too, like earlier forms of life, will ever stretch forward and upward in the hope of a yet higher stage—the new humanity which is in Christ The increasing purpose of manifestation, the creative work of the divine Word, found its perfect term in Jesus, so far as that was possible within the limits of an historical personality The work is continued on earth through the Church, the Body of Christ, and through every other emergence into life of the Eternal Values of God

What then of the work of the Holy Spirit? This begins, in the sense we have described, whenever and wherever the manifestation of Righteousness and Wisdom meets a soul which can recognize it The work reaches its true form when the revelation of spiritual value meets a soul which can respond with devotion, the religious devotion which is due to Absolute Value The work attains its full power when God the Father sends His Holy Spirit to enable the soul to respond with self devotion to the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, the manifestation of the Eternal Word of God In early religion,¹ as Dr Oman has well shewn, there is a real, though dim, conscience of such an absolute claim In the religion

¹ In *Science Religion and Reality* p 291

of Christ there is a flood of glorious light which reveals the reasonableness of the demand for perfect and absolute devotion. If in the New Testament and in much Christian thought the work of the Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit almost defy differentiation, there is good ground for this. The man Christ Jesus was filled with the Holy Spirit. As such He was enabled to manifest the very Word of God in a human life. As such He was enabled with absolutely holy devotion to endure the Cross. As such, made one with Perfection, he was endued with the creative power of Perfection, so that through Him the Holy Spirit could for ever continue to work. So too, in the higher life of all men, it is through the holiness of their devotion to the good that they receive power to do good. First the manifestation of the Word to the soul; then the work of the Holy Spirit enabling the soul to respond with devotion; last the commission and the power to co-operate with God.

At the beginning of this Paper I said that it would only be one chapter in the theological approach to this great subject. You will see that we have hardly touched the creative work of the Holy Spirit in man: the work, that is, of enabling the soul to arise and to expand, so that the Word of God may make it an instrument of his own creative mission. I have only time to add a very few notes upon this.

CREATOR SPIRITUS.

If it is true that it is through the holiness of their devotion to the good that men receive power to do good, then we are not far from the truth about the Creative work of the Spirit in man. It is the work of making all things new, the work of inspiration, of prophecy, of new birth, new humanity, a new order

of life and truth and love It makes our faith a religion of everlasting hope

(1) Firstly it is by revelation What is the test of revelation? The truth revealed must, we shall agree, prove itself quickly or slowly by enhancing and transforming all our values of thought and life, by making reason more reasonable and by elevating, deepening, and enriching life and love But above all when a revelation arrives it must arrive as a word from the living God It must come with an Authority which is from above and which demands sacrifice Again and again we read in the history of great poets and scientists that inspiration came to them as something given, not the result of their own powers and efforts, but as a gift from the Beyond It is only the great prophet who can experience this knowledge of a gift from the Transcendent Inspired by the Holy Spirit with a passionate concentration his soul can expand to receive the new revelation Thereafter he is the servant of the Word of God, and it is because he is plainly surrendered to the Authority of the Word, that men are won to hear him and to accept the revelation even before they can understand it.

(2) But the Creative Work of the Spirit is not reserved only for the great It is operative in the body of believers It gives conviction of the "sacred," to use a word of Dr Oman's That is, it gives insight to recognize and devotion to obey the things which come with a claim to be absolute values "Make sacred the Christ in your hearts as Lord" An individual, a society, an epoch is judged by that which is their "sacred" This is their religion and their way of progress For us the supreme revelation has arrived through the Christ But the work of receiving it and of making it effective for thought and life is the task of the whole body Revelations through great prophets may yet come Their coming will

depend in part on the power of the prophetic spirit in the body. Every member has the vocation to help, by making sure his conviction of the sacred, by thinking and living for the supremacy in thought and life of the highest that is revealed to him. This is the way to meet each crisis in the Church, as St. Paul met his crisis by making "sacred" the universality of God's love. This is the way of progressive theology, which seeks by labour of mind to reshape theories, e.g. of Atonement, or of Punishment, according to the sovereignty of love. This is the way for Bible study which seeks to judge the Bible as a whole according to the most "sacred" mind of Christ. This is the way to solve the almost hopeless difficulty of transforming the body of modern industry so that it may be an organ of brotherhood. It can only be solved by a new spiritual consciousness, by some touch of passionate devotion to spiritual values. This is the way to Reunion; for the Revelation of the Catholic Church that is to be will never come without a diffused but powerful devotion to the highest values of religious life and especially through the full and frank recognition of the Eternal Life as already the common possession of all true disciples.

Perhaps our chief need to-day is the need of a living hope for individual progress in the life of the Spirit. The spiritual life has not only these two chapters, the consciousness of redemption from sin and the consciousness of respectability ever after. As von Hügel would say it is above all the duty of the Church to keep alive the taste and the thirst of the salt which Christ has put in our mouths, the taste and the thirst for the sacred and the supernatural as our heavenly calling upon earth. And this supernatural includes, though it transcends, all the values which are already known as the things that make life worth living.

Dr. Theodore Merz has made an interesting observation upon the dawn of mental life in the child. It is from the mother's face brooding over the cradle that the babe catches the first dim consciousness of its own personality. The aged philosopher added in conversation "Just so man looked up into the face of Jesus Christ and found himself."

You may remember von Hügel's little sketch of the "parental" temper of Charles Darwin and the "loving humility which joyfully bends down and contracts itself into the life of creatures lower than man." So too the condescending grace of the heavenly Father broods in the Spirit over the chaos in our lives, nurturing whatever germ of holiness may lead to life and joy and freedom; enabling the soul to turn with devotion to the Lord and to reflect the same image and be transformed.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT: (c) IN THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH

(ii) By REV. F. R. BARRY, M.A., D.S.O.,
*Professor of the New Testament in King's College,
London.*

THE subject which has been assigned to me is the Holy Spirit in the Church. It is hard enough to daunt the most foolhardy, and yet one which we certainly must not shirk. For there are few points at which current religious teaching is so weak and hazy as on this matter. The Holy Spirit is something we refer to in connection with Baptism and Confirmation, and with certain rather mild and unmasculine virtues; but apart from these occasions, very seldom. For the great mass of churchmen, anyhow, the Spirit remains unreal and remote, a dogmatic mystery of the pulpit, but in no clear or vital connection with the Christian's life and the concrete tasks of our time. But this is in the strongest possible contrast to the attitude of the New Testament, where the Spirit is the dominant category and, indeed, the essential fact in the new religion. For the New Testament, to be a Christian is to be one who has received the Spirit and is a member of the Brotherhood, sharing its faith, its worship and its word.

The two things, we notice, are inseparable. The Spirit, then, is the dynamic force which organizes the Society and inspires and empowers the whole sweep and range of Christian interests and activities—economic, social, oral and aesthetic, as well as those that are technically "religious."

This conception agrees with the statement of the Creed, where the Spirit is qualified by just two

words *Κρις* καὶ *Ζωοποιεῖν*, sovereign and life giving—the decisive Fact and the controlling Life. We must try to day to recover this conception of the Spirit in the whole range of human life. It is only putting the same thing in another way if we say that we must attempt to bring those values—Beauty, Truth, Justice, etc.—which our generation rightly reveres, the activities which it rightly thinks worth while, inside the circumference of the Gospel and the Christian scheme of thought and life.

At present they stand deplorably outside, and the weakness of organized religion (of which we are all lamentably conscious) is, to my mind, very largely the resultant of the weakness of our thinking here. Religion has become a thing apart, the temperamental hobby of the few, and the Church's life has been too much narrowed down to purely devotional acts and attitudes, very widely sundered from the actual

else's right to express himself—which seems to be the only obligation which the "1926 class" will recognize. But at once one is compelled to raise the question, Which of my many selves am I to express? The doctrine of the Spirit is the Christian answer. Everyone answers, Your best or ideal self, but it is fundamental to all religion to recognize that this is God within us. Traditional phrases like "putting on the new man" mean that the empirical, actual self is redirected and transfigured by the action of the divine within us.

So the question for us is not, Am I expressing myself? but rather Am I expressing God? In this sense St. Paul called Christ the "Second Adam"—the focus of new human possibilities and new qualities in living. And the doctrine of the Spirit means in practice—whatever its theological implications—the infusion of a new divine quality into the manifold activities of mankind—a divine life, imparted through Jesus, and the direct and immediate result of His life and death and resurrection. It will make for clearness if we work at present with this closely defined and limited conception. Later on I shall seek to widen it, and remind you of what has been said in earlier papers about the Spirit in Creation and in history before the coming of Christ. But the Holy Spirit, for Christian theology, means something new and distinctively Christian, which was first disclosed and conferred through Jesus.

I need not, I hope, spend time in working out how clearly this is set forth in the New Testament. Epistles and Gospels alike are concerned to emphasize the connection between the Cross and Resurrection and the coming of the Spirit to His followers as the consummation of the historic Life. It was the fulfilment of His own prediction that beyond the Cross He would return in triumph to establish His

reign in the hearts of men And the New Testament shows us, half undesignedly, what the coming of the Spirit implied How did it express itself in act? What happened, in other words, at Pentecost?¹

The Spirit was verified in a special structure. There was, admittedly, in the earliest years a tendency to equate possessing the Spirit with certain forms of emotional excitement, but its lasting effect was soon seen to be *ethical* The permanent Creation of the Spirit was the Brotherhood, the Community, the *Koinonia*—the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost Men found themselves welded into a new unity. The most recalcitrant prejudices and enmities, the most incurable misunderstandings, were transcended in a new Society.

There is something here quite different in kind from mere natural interests and affections It was no mere operation of herd instinct, no mere drawing together of men with kindred tastes (I do not think the writer of *II Peter* had many tastes in common with "St. John") It was a community of transfigured people, the centre of whose lives had been shifted, the quality of whose lives had been enriched. That is the first thing that forces itself upon us—this new quality of *sheer living* It was nothing far fetched or ecclesiastical, but the emergence on to the field of history, under the pressure of supernatural influence, of finer and richer human material in average, commonplace men and women Our Lord had described in the Beatitudes that temper and attitude of mind and will which makes for the coming of the Kingdom St Paul's great lyric in *I Cor. xiii* is, as it were, the Sermon on the Mount re-written in the light of Pentecost It is, if you like, a word-portrait of the character of Jesus But more, it is a

¹ See the paper with this title by Dr Anderson Scott in Dr Streeter's volume, *The Spirit* (Macmillan)

description of "Agape"—that distinctively new Christian quality for which no word in our language is adequate. It describes what human life begins to look like when the Spirit gets to work upon it. Men had to seek new words to describe the qualities which began to emerge as the Spirit created them. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace." First and foremost, then, the Holy Spirit is creative of personality. The Spirit produced, in the community, *richer and finer qualities of living*. People were interested in finer things, less absorbed in silly trivialities. (Perhaps it is here that we need the Spirit most.)

Observe how these qualities work themselves out in action. Take, for example, the gradual transformation of all personal relationship—the place of women and children in the family, the acceptance of reciprocal obligations as between the master and the slave. Look at the new attitude to work, regarded as a constructive contribution to the *economic needs of the community*. Look at the antiseptic sincerity introduced in the social life and intercourse, or that disciplined buoyancy and youthfulness which so astonished a *disillusioned world* (*Rom. xii*; *Eph. vi*, etc.). The activities of the Christian Community were not merely what we should call "religious": they were economic, social, aesthetic. There was, it is true, a foreshortening of perspective due to their expectation of the Parousia. So there is no "Copec" in the New Testament. But within the circle of recognized activities, the Spirit meant for them the whole range of life oriented and lived in a new way. The Eucharist—we would specially emphasize this—was not merely a "religious" act; it was also a practical measure of poor-relief by the provision of a common table. It was, that is, at one and the same time the culmination of the Church's worship and its economic

description of "Agape"—that distinctively new Christian quality for which no word in our language is adequate. It describes what human life begins to look like when the Spirit gets to work upon it. Men had to seek new words to describe the qualities which began to emerge as the Spirit created them. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace." First and foremost, then, the Holy Spirit is creative of personality. The Spirit produced, in the community, *richer and finer qualities of living*. People were interested in finer things, less absorbed in silly trivialities. (Perhaps it is here that we need the Spirit most.)

Observe how these qualities work themselves out in action. Take, for example, the gradual transformation of all personal relationship—the place of women and children in the family, the acceptance of reciprocal obligations as between the master and the slave. Look at the new attitude to work, regarded as a constructive contribution to the economic needs of the community. Look at the antiseptic sincerity introduced in the social life and intercourse, or that disciplined buoyancy and youthfulness which so astonished a disillusioned world (*Rom. xiii*; *Eph. vi*, etc.). The activities of the Christian Community were not merely what we should call "religious": they were economic, social, aesthetic. There was, it is true, a foreshortening of perspective due to their expectation of the Parousia. So there is no "Copee" in the New Testament. But within the circle of recognized activities, the Spirit meant for them the whole range of life oriented and lived in a new way. The Eucharist—we would specially emphasize this—was not merely a "religious" act; it was also a practical measure of poor-relief by the provision of a common table. It was, that is, at one and the same time the culmination of the Church's worship *and* its economic

expedient for the expression of Agape in Action (*Acts* ii. 43; iv. 32; v. 1-11; iv. 1-2; *I Cor.* xi). The "Sacramental" teaching of our time is only just beginning to rediscover that.

Once more, from the very first, Christianity poured its new spirit into Art.¹ Not its least artistic achievement is the New Testament itself, where the broken, rude vernacular of the "Koine" becomes the instrument of a supreme literature. The New Spirit clothed itself in architecture, and though at first the drama was forbidden it (because of its idolatrous associations) it embodied itself in sculpture and in painting. Compare the gay simplicity of the Catacombs with the solemn funeral monuments of the Appian Way; contrast their decorative schemes with what we can still see on the walls of a shameless and vulgar little town like Pompeii. We are in a different spiritual climate. The subject-matter of both arts is the same, the conventions the same, the technique the same: but the Christian art has its own antiseptic quality. Both the Church and the World cherished the lamp of beauty; but inside the Church (if one can put it so) a different light is shining in the lamp. Survey the different departments of life in this way, and one gets a glimpse of what the Spirit conferred—an indefinable attitude or temper which gives a distinctive supernatural quality to the natural goods and activities of life. One begins to see then what the Master meant when He said His followers were to be like salt—preventing civilization from going bad.

All these manifold efforts and activities, thus redirected and transmuted, radiated out from the glowing centre of intimate Christian experience—life

¹ For correction of many current misunderstandings on this matter see Dr. Dearmer's essay on Christian Art in *The Necessity of Art*. (S.C.M.)

emptied of self, cleansed, forgiven⁴, received into fellowship with God, lifted to new heights of possibility in the service of the Divine Society

PART II

That is our impression of the earliest times. Let us now skip a thousand years or so and watch the result lower down the stream of history. We all know what has happened in the meantime. The Church is no longer a persecuted sect, it is, indeed no longer merely a Church. It has become a specific civilization, and "Christendom" is by this time a cultural area. The actual form that the Church has assumed was largely conditioned by historical forces and it is clear that the Church has taken over as the price of its acceptance by the world a considerable amount of alien and, to the last, intractable material. There emerged what we call mediæval catholicism.

We will not sentimentalize the Middle Ages—a barbarous and beastly time in many ways nor overpraise the mediæval Church. I suppose the romantic myth of Merrie England has been finally drummed out of court by Dr Coulton¹. Nobody who reads his history will be blind to the faults of the mediæval Church, nor is that the weakness of our generation. Yet it was, after all, a magnificent attempt to give human life a constructive unity. In ideal, at least, the entire range of life was organized round Religion as its centre. All thought, in the intellectual hierarchy, depended from Theology as its apex. the functional organization of Society gave to all men, and to all life's activities their appointed place in a chain of functions which "held" in the

¹ See *The Mediæval Village* (Cambridge University Press) and other works by contrast with the Chesterton Belloc School

last resort of God. Life was mapped and even rigidly ordered, but it was not merely departmentalized—the whole was present to and in the parts. With all its faults, the mediæval system was a magnificent experiment—an attempt at the manifestation of the Spirit through all the range of human thought and action in a Church coterminous with Life. It was magnificent—but it had to go. It laid intolerable fetters across intellectual and industrial progress and was barring the path to the next stage of development. It could not keep pace with changing conditions and the growing complexity of life, and its break up was an inevitable stage in the advance of modern civilization.

Each branch of thought had to claim its independence of theological control. Philosophy, Science, History, Economics, and (almost in our own day), Psychology have established their complete autonomy, their right to pursue and work out their own conclusions according to the laws of their own subject matter, untrammelled by religious presuppositions. The scientific triumphs of the modern world are the fruits of that revolution. The race has been freed from a burden of pain and terror before which mediæval religion was frankly impotent. But our world has had to pay a fearful price for it. Mr. Tawney, for instance, has shown in his brilliant book¹ the cost in sheer human flesh and blood which has followed on the claim of economics to be free of religious and moral standards of reference. And life, as a whole, has lost its unity. It has broken up into specialized departments largely unrelated to one another, and all unrelated to any ultimate standard. So it has come about that Religion to-day is, in the large, simply one activity side by side with all the

¹ R. L. Tawney *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (J. Murray)

others, not standing even in vital relation to them. Religion is ceasing to be the inspiration of life's best ideals and activities. And obviously that spells a double loss. They are losing their quality and "saltiness," and Religion itself is left thin and bloodless, with no strong roots spreading out into life. The Churches as we know them to day are mainly *devotional* associations; they are not fellowships of life and work. I do not in the least underrate the preciousness of the Church simply as a fellowship of worship. But certainly it is something very much less, and infinitely less rich in content, than the Community of the New Testament.

Baron von Hügel put it admirably.¹

Religion has, in the rough and tumble of life, and by and for the average institutionalist, been too often conceived as though arising *in vacuo*, and hence as able, even in the long run, to dispense with or starve the other activities and necessities of Man. . . . And in proportion as that is effected, Religion becomes bereft of the material, the friction, the witness so essential to the health and fruitfulness of man in general and of Religion in particular.

We must rescue Religion from this anæmic state, or it will become merely pathological. We must bring back its power into the world of affairs or the world will die for lack of its inspiration. This, as I said, is our practical urgent problem. How can we recover the synthesis of life, bringing all our purpose and strivings inside the circumference of the Gospel? How can we set forth the Spirit in the Church as the soul and power of all life's aims and functions?

In the short time that is left to me, it is possible only to indicate in outline the approach which I would suggest towards an answer.

¹ *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, p. 60 (J. M. Dent)

PART III.

(1). I suggest then, first, that we must bear in mind the vast range of divine activity which lies outside and behind the Church. We should all, for example, admit that effective prayer presupposes a training in the wider background of a man's life as a whole, his emotional and intellectual attitudes.

Because God's redemptive activity presupposes His creative work. The Church itself did not begin at Pentecost: the Spirit that inspires the Christian Church is the same Spirit that "spake by the Prophets." But in Christianity something more was added. We belong to a Pre-Christian fellowship which has been permeated and renewed. That involves, I think, that we must see the Church projected, as it were, against the background of all the other divine operations—in Science, in Art, pre-Christian religion and morals, and down all the ways of advancing civilization. "The un-incarnate God (as von Hugel says¹) has a wider range, though a less deep message, than the Incarnate God; and these two Gods are but one and the same God, who mysteriously, mostly slowly and imperceptibly, prepares or supplements, expresses or otherwise aids Himself, in each way by the other way." To see that is to see that all those activities which we commonly call non-religious—Science, Art, Politics, Industry, all worthy human aspirations, even on the purely economic level—all come from the same God as the Church's life does. Their autonomy must be reverently respected, in the sense that there must be no attempt at ecclesiastical control of them. We must not seek to forestall their conclusions or to interfere with or prescribe their methods. But that does not mean that they are "non-religious."

¹ *Essays and Addresses*, p. 134

The worship of the Christian Community, in its conscious relation to the Supernatural, is at once their crown and their inspiration. For because Religion is contact with Reality, we cannot acquiesce in any view of it which would make it just a department of life, side by side with other activities. It embraces the ends of all right endeavour. It is *an attitude to life as a whole*—the total response to life and all its problems of those who know that the things which are temporal find their meaning only in the eternal. It is to offer and dedicate life to God at every point of human contact with it. The laws of God move at different levels—all flesh is not the same flesh—and theology is incapable of dealing with the laws of God which hold in chemistry. Yet, remember, they are all laws of God. So religion must fructify the whole of life, while recognizing that the life of spirit must always be lived at many different levels each obeying the laws of its own subject matter.

(2) When that is recognized then we can see that the Holy Spirit of Christian Theology is a unique gift, a revelation—the operation of God in man *through Jesus*, conferring a new, supernatural quality on all the activities of life. In the power of it, Ethics take on a new tone—the difference between St. Francis and Socrates. Scientific research becomes an exploration of the mind and will of the Father of Jesus Christ, art an attempted expression of His beauty, industry, politics, social administration, an attempt to embody our brotherhood in the Spirit. This is the end which the Church exists to serve—the Church exists to redeem Society. That means, to supernaturalize all human motive, to lift character to new planes, to transfuse and transfigure the whole life of men by the Spirit of Sonship which is in Jesus, till, in all its levels and throughout its range, the life

of man expresses the Christ Spirit. This is surely involved in the phrase *The Body of Christ*. By its faithfulness here, the Church stands or falls. And more and more this conception of the Church, as existing in right of the end it has to serve, is going, I think, to be the court of appeal which will test the validity of its life and ministry. "By their fruits"—said the Master—"ye shall know them", and every man and every institution must submit to that pragmatic, acid test. And so—if I may suggest in a few words what is really a theological revolution—when men ask, "Is this a true Branch of the Church?" no archaeological research will supply an answer to the question, but its present record and its future aim. Not the past, but the present and the future will be decisive.

(3) You will feel that the conception I am offering you lacks any clear logical definition, and remains intangible and irreducible to rough and ready calculation. That is true, but it is inevitable. It is all a question of quality and motive, it is something we can recognize when we see it, but cannot predict or define *a priori*. Our tasks and duties are determined for us by temperament, environment and so forth. At the point where I am, this and this needs doing. But what, *precisely*, it is that I have to do, Christianity, as such, will never tell me. That is not the function of the Spirit. The Spirit confers an inward disposition, a quality and a richness in thought and act. But there are no rules which can be codified. To copy Jesus is not the Christian ethic, it is to translate His Spirit into action—a far more difficult and costly thing. The Spirit imparts the ideal attitude to God and Man and the values of life, its *content*, and the path of actual duty, we are left to find out for ourselves, by dispassionate study of the facts,

by the use of our technical and professional skill, in a world that is not yet fully Christianized. That involves a certain delicacy and tension—a sort of Spirit-guided compromise.

(4). But remember that no one individual Christian can conceivably sustain or express all that is meant by life in the Spirit. No individual can mirror Christ; he can merely do his own task in the world in such loyalty to the Spirit as he can. To redeem Society, to mirror Christ in the whole range of Man's activity, is the task of the whole Body, the Christian Church, which is—in its essence—a world-wide Society, whose frontiers are coterminous with humanity. Christianity, that is to say, is still in the making, and its fullest meanings are yet to be disclosed, as the Church grows in extent as well as in depth. It needs the whole race to set forth the riches of Christ. Our religion is still in its infancy, and we shall see greater things than these. The Church—in which we daily profess belief—is a process that yet remains unrealized.

(5). This, then, is the conception I would offer you of the Spirit operative in the Church. The Christian Church is a society which cuts across, but accepts and seeks to permeate, all other human associations, realizing that they, too, are of God, but that God is more fully revealed in its own life. Its members seek to live in all life's activities by the supernatural gift of the Spirit. They recognize that the life of the Spirit must always be lived, in this world, on various levels, ranging from the need for bread and clothing up to the highest pinnacle of worship, and in the Eucharist they set forth bread—the elemental need of men and women—as the vehicle of the Divine life itself. They seek, in this way, to infuse a new quality into life thus lived on these different planes; “and in all of them works

one and the selfsame Spirit" Our tasks are the same as the tasks of other men, but we try to approach them in a different attitude. The Church, then, in its teaching of its members, should point them first to the duties and tasks of life and the values in which the Being of God is expressed, and then to the sources of power and conservation in the Spirit of the Divine fellow-traveller, who is the inmost life of the Christian brotherhood. Thus the worship of the Church becomes not a half irrelevant, merely pious exercise, but the spontaneous expression of a mind and will that are led by the Spirit of God. It will be the blossom on the tree of life—the creative aspiration of a fellowship concerned with "getting on with the world's work" but whose life is (as St. Paul says) "in the heavenlies," rooted in supernatural realities.

NOTE

To reinforce and illustrate my contention, I append quotations from two great thinkers to whom my indebtedness is obvious —

(1) "We cannot escape sectarianism even by sacrificing the Creeds, still less by attempting a wholly unreal identification of the Church with the nation—an identification which had ceased to represent all the facts even in the time of Hooker, and has been becoming less true ever since. Neither, on the other hand, in such a world can you without disaster attempt to impose the standards of the Church on the whole mass of your countrymen. Every attempt to raise the code of the nation (by legislation) to that of the Church, leads, if unsuccessful to an attempt to lower the code of the Church to that of the world, because it proceeds from a notion that at bottom the two are identical. Wherever men try to sanctify the world by raising it (i.e. by imposing laws, etc.) to the level of the Church they commonly succeed only in lowering the life of the Church to accommodate it to the

practice of the world—the two centuries which began with Pope Boniface VIII ended with Alexander VI

J N Figgis *Churches in the Modern State* pp 183-4

(2) The State is fanatical the moment it attempts to require or supply such motives virtues and consummations and the Church is an irritating superfluity a feeble d tto of the State the moment it forgets that precisely this forms its specific work and call the awakening the training the bringing into full life and fruitfulness of the supernatural life

Von Hügel *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of religion* p 283

(3) We religious men will have to develop *as part of our religion* the ceaseless sense of its requiring the *nidus* materials stimulant discipline of the other God given non religious duties activities ideals of man from his physical and psychical necessities up to his aesthetic political and philosophical aspirations The autonomy competition and criticism of the other centres of life will have to become welcome to religion for the sake of religion itself

Von Hügel pp 62-3

II.

THE WAY OF THE SPIRIT: (a) IN THE INDIVIDUAL.

(i) By WILLIAM BROWN, M.D., D.Sc.,

*Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy in the
University of Oxford,*

Psychotherapist to King's College Hospital, London.

ANY theory of personality is faced with a special problem in determining the position of values—goodness, truth, beauty—and of religion within the circle of individual experience. We can only deal with it in its most general aspect here.

There is nothing very much to be said from a formal point of view with regard to ethics. On this side the real problem is that of obligation, and however much we may accumulate empirical knowledge on the subject of human conduct we do not thereby get any deeper insight into the nature of obligation than we should by considering ordinary cases of everyday life. Empirical considerations—considerations of the experience of different races at different periods of history—show that duties change and vary with circumstances. What is the right thing to do at one period of time, within one circle of culture and at one epoch of history, may be different from what should be done at some other period of time. But in both cases there is a feeling of obligation involved, and something which is more than a mere psychological feeling, something which seems to go deeper than a mere human feeling, something which seems absolute—namely, obligation. "I have to do this; this is my duty." And if you ask why, all you can say is, "because it is my duty." You cannot give a reason

for it. In the end you give an approximate reason for doing some particular thing, and having given that reason you ask why you should act with reference to that reason, and the only reply is "Because I am bound to act so, it is obligatory on me to act as I do, e.g. to treat everybody as an end and not merely as a means, to avoid giving objectless pain to others, to promote the happiness in the world in general." If you ask the reasons why you should do it, you find none apart from this which is more than a mere momentary feeling which is a conviction. Thus duties change, but duty remains the same. Obligations change and vary with circumstances, but obligation as such is there, and cannot be evaded. We can ignore it, but we suffer by ignoring it, and find ourselves falling to a lower level of spiritual development.

The situation is similar to that with regard to knowledge itself. You cannot explain knowledge as such. Truth itself cannot be explained. You can indicate the way in which truth arises—the way in which an individual may approximate more and more to truth through observation, and through the adequate and harmonious working of association. You can understand how error arises through false associations and how delusions may arise, but the truth itself cannot be explained. It is an ideal which we feel is a reality, but a reality which is never completely reached by us. It is there. So far as we trouble to think at all it is implied. So with the appreciation of beauty, or aesthetic experience we can describe the conditions under which the individual becomes more and more expert in the appreciation of beauty of different kinds like music and the plastic arts but in itself we cannot understand it. We can describe the concomitants specially involved in the contemplation of different works of art, the pleasure

of a peculiar nature, which we say is aesthetic, but that is not the aesthetic experience itself. In a similar way with morality, we can indicate how an individual becomes more and more moral by learning to be more and more disinterested in his outlook on life, but why he should be disinterested we cannot say. That is simply borne in upon us. We do judge others in that way at any rate. We put other people in the rank of moral excellence to the extent to which they fight for the good of the community and the whole of existence rather than for themselves alone.

How it is possible to pursue the ethical ideal is again really a mystery. We feel that true freedom is involved in this. It is true that the great ethical writer, Henry Sidgwick, used to protest that the general problem of freedom was of little importance to ethical theory, but others would not agree with him. I certainly should not. It seems to me that the truly ethical outlook on life is bound up with belief in self-determination, in the power of the mind to act from itself, from within itself. It must be active rather than merely passive. Instead of being merely moved from outside by various physically external or psychologically external motives, it must be able to take a definite stand, it must be able to identify itself with the moral law. That seems to me to mean freedom. In conventional morality you identify yourself with a code of conduct because you wish to do as others do, but such conduct is only by accident moral, if moral at all. In truly moral action you realize its rationality, but more than that and beyond that you realize its value, and you have in you some direct power of realizing its value. This is called conscience. Unfortunately the word conscience is rather spoiled for our purpose, because it is so often identified with accidental feelings that vary from time to time, and with individual experience

that can be disturbed in disease. It is here that Freud's doctrine of the "ego ideal" or "super ego," as set out, e.g., in his essay *Das Ich und das Es*, is in place. But such a theory is quite inadequate to explain conscience and obligation as such. No merely psychological explanation could suffice. A person can be over-conscientious, and it is interesting to notice in these disease cases that over conscientiousness goes with a lack of morality and not with an excess of morality. Patients suffering from over conscientiousness are over conscientious about less important things and not over the really fundamental things. One's attention is drawn from time to time to an announcement in the newspaper that someone has sent an anonymous cheque to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for income tax, and it is called conscience money. That conscience money is always a very small amount. The last amount I saw was £1 5s. You may be sure that if that person had been really guilty of defrauding the income tax collectors, and had taken the trouble afterwards to make restitution, the amount would be much greater than £1 5s. I look on cases like that as pathological cases, pathological disturbances of conscience, but conscience in a psychological sense and not in a truly ethical sense. One feels one needs another word. It is a direct feeling of obligation, just as much a rational thing as an emotional thing. The most moral people are not the most emotional people about conduct. So in matters of the intellect, a person who is sound in his work as a scientist or a philosopher is generally not so emotional as one less sound. The same rule applies to aesthetic appreciation, e.g., in appreciation of music in the course of the necessary training of the musical sense, one must learn to get away from crude emotion. That crude emotion is a temporary thing showing that the mind is caught

up and stimulated and is reacting, but the emotion is too individual, and one has to appreciate the general, the universal, in all these things. In music and the other arts, one has to appreciate, as Plato and Schopenhauer said, the idea. One has a direct vision of the idea, or of the relationship between ideas. And emotions stand in one's way. It is true that there is a peculiar feeling in aesthetic and intellectual and moral appreciation—e.g., in appreciation of duty done for its own sake, quite apart from, and in addition to, circumstances being considered, and the consequences. I am inclined to think that here one has the soul, the ego, the self, and reacting in its essence.

I have tried to avoid this, but I am brought now to the consideration of a view which by most people would not be regarded as sound. The self, the mind that psychology deals with, is not the same as the soul. Psychology is not the science of the soul, psychology is the science of the mind, of mental process in time, but corresponding with that mental process in time, and as a complement of it, you have the experiencing ego, and that ego has its own reality and its own unity. This is the idea of the pure ego, as distinct from the empirical ego. Psychology deals with the empirical ego, shows how it develops in course of time, how the young child starts life with the empirical ego partially organized, to a certain extent inherited. The child inherits aptitudes and interests from ancestors, just as it inherits the organization of the physical body. Talent is inherited, but genius is not inherited. Talent is characteristic of the empirical ego, the inter relation of the pure ego with the material environment. Genius is characteristic of the pure ego, which is out of time, although it reveals itself in time. The explanation of genius does not come from heredity anyway. If you

consider Beethoven, you do not find any evidence—and if you are going to be scientific, you must judge by evidence—of that power of giving meaning to musical sounds and creating artistic form, in his ancestors or in the history of the race. Genius can show itself not only in art, but in philosophy and morals. Socrates and Jesus were moral geniuses. You are dealing all the time with a different level of reality.

A dualism like this is not, in the end, intellectually satisfying, for the reason that the intellect is a unifying thing, that what we mean by thinking is unifying, systematizing, fitting things within a system. When we form a hypothesis, what we do is to observe a number of facts, and see their implications and inter-relationships with one another, and so far as we find they form a unity, we consider that we are getting better insight. This unifying principle is an urge that forces us along. No dualism can be ultimately satisfactory. In our philosophy we must try to synthesize knowledge of the empirical ego and knowledge of the pure ego. That cannot yet be done. We do not know enough about it. It is better, however, to draw distinctions, so long as they are really the right distinctions, than to synthesize too hurriedly and mix things up. It is most important to distinguish this value experience from the empirical experience. The distinction which emphasizes the essential importance of value, over against chance experiences that occur to us from moment to moment and from day to day, is extremely important for our theory of personality, because it puts the centre of the gravity of the personality in the right place.

The value-experiences of the good, the beautiful and the true, are not identical with religious experience, although they are related to it. Religious

experience is not exactly on all fours with them, it is not on the same level but is on a higher level still. Religious experience arises so far as the individual is facing the totality of existence. The feeling thus aroused, so far as the personality takes up a mental attitude towards the whole universe, is religious experience. Within it the value attitudes are of the utmost importance, and we tend nowadays to emphasize the ethical attitude, the appreciation of goodness, duty, obligation, in relation to religion. But if we study it psychologically we see that there is not a point to point correspondence between genuine feelings of religion and genuine feelings of morality. A person may have strong religious feelings which are not merely emotion but a genuine awareness of mystery, of the totality of things—of a great mystery with its own peculiar feeling of communion and satisfaction in communion—in relative independence of the extent to which he fulfils the moral law, or the extent to which his conscience is sensitive, or the extent to which he is aware of his duty—what he should do and his obligation to do it. And conversely we may find another person who reaches a very high degree of ethical excellence, who is very strict in doing his duty in life for its own sake, in the right way not in the pathological way, and yet with no very intense feeling or conviction as regards his attitude towards the totality of things. We must separate the two. I do not mean that either of them can be completely absent. It would be going too far to say that anyone exists who is entirely deficient in the ethical or religious attitude, but because they do not tend to run parallel they must be distinguished on the psychological level. But the level to which they really belong is not the psychological level. It is a higher level, and the level of religion is higher even than that of value. There is

the level of value, but the level of religion is higher than the level of value in the sense that it is more all-inclusive and more face to face with totality and the innermost mystery of existence. Thus there are aspects, ethical, aesthetic and logical, which are all aspects of reality, but religion itself is an attitude to reality in its concreteness. The values are important, and it is difficult to conceive religion apart from them. We should probably be right in saying that normal human nature has a religious sense, not in the out-of-date sense of faculty psychology, but in the form of a primitive tendency towards the religious attitude—to feel the mystery, the beneficence, and perhaps the sternness of the spirit of the universe. This is gradually revised in the course of the individual's life, it is freed more and more from irrelevant experience just as the appreciation of music or other forms of art is gradually freed from irrelevant experiences.

With regard to this religious attitude, we must recognize how it varies in emphasis from person to person, and we must be ready to attach importance to what we find in the experience of those who are most taken up with it. The saints and the martyrs, by living the religious life, have shown the earnestness and the reality of it. There is always the question of *pathological emphasis that runs through all this subject*. As we see in the case of conscience, a direct feeling may be emphasized pathologically, and our criterion there would no doubt be the criterion of balance. We find that where the conscience is pathologically over-emphasized it is out of proportion. In a similar way some people are over-religious in a pathological sense, they are unbalanced and their religion carries with it a lot of crude emotion that does not belong to religion at all. It is sometimes called hysteria, or by some other name derived from psychopathology. Even in the lives of great saints and martyrs one

finds distinguishing aspects and characteristics that are pathological, especially in the conversion experience which some of them have passed through. Yet by taking them not individually but in relation one to another, and comparing their inner experience with their outward conduct, one gains a fairly satisfactory impression of what in them was true religion and what was spurious emotion due to a slight overbalancing of the mind when face to face with this stupendous mystery. So just as they themselves in examining their own lives gradually learn and advance in religious insight—learn to throw aside certain experiences or turn aside from them—so the observer, the psychologist or the philosopher, or the student of the philosophy of religion, comparing these individual experiences, can in that way learn what religion means in the lives of others. That is the empirical side. You cannot say *a priori* what religion should be, just as you cannot say *a priori* what beauty or morality or truth will be. That form of the *priori* has been abandoned by everyone. When we say that these values are beyond the merely empirical, we do not mean to say that they are *a priori*. We learn them through experience, but in the course of experience we separate them out, we sift ourselves by self-discipline, and by observing others disciplining themselves we see how they get more and more direct insight into reality.

Let me try to make this argument more concrete in regard to aesthetic experience. Suppose we take architecture. A Greek column is aesthetically pleasing. Consider by the side of that Greek column the picture of Atlas holding up the world. You contemplate that and feel uncomfortable, you feel that it is something incongruous, not aesthetically pleasing. On the other hand contemplate the structure of an ordinary wall. That is not in itself

aesthetically pleasing—the Greek column is. What is the difference? Schopenhauer's theory is that, in each of these instances, there are two ideas in relation to one another—the idea of weight and the idea of support. In the case of the wall the support is too great for the weight. In the case of Atlas the weight is too great for the support. In the case of the Greek column weight and support are adequately adjusted to each other. It gives a feeling and an awareness of harmonious relationship. And the aesthetic reality with which one is in contact when appreciating the Greek column is not essentially one of pleasure in harmony, but a direct awareness of harmony in those two ideas—the aspects of weight and support. Two people may be able to appreciate the Greek column as a work of art to the same extent, but the one person may feel strong emotion about it and the other may not. One person may feel great pleasure, and the other not so pronounced physical pleasure. The aesthetic experience is not the same thing as physical pleasure. It is an experience of harmony. In the personality that experience comes from the soul itself, it is its inmost characteristic.

If a person asks himself what he really is, he finds himself faced with the need of analysis. A good way to carry it out is to get analysed over a long period in which one works over all one's past, and in that way discards a lot of accidental accretions and hysterical and sentimental associations, and, looking upon the process as a sort of long death bed, survey one's past as something not entirely past and done with, asking oneself what it all amounts to, what one expected and expects of the world, what one really values in life and in others. One finds that it is not accidental or mere physical pleasure, or any immediate and momentary sequence of experience. The temporal aspect as such falls away. One finds oneself seeing

life more from the point of view of the eternal. Even temporal experience itself can be eternal. There are two general forms of temporal experience. There is the mere sequence of one's life from moment to moment—it is that form of the temporal that is *appearance and not reality*. That in itself is of no value. But we succeed more or less in transcending it the whole time, at one time more than at another. In one sense the temporal is a mere nothing. In another sense it is important, because it is woven into our experience, inasmuch as it is a condition of our appreciating, especially, e.g., the sequence of notes in music. And yet in that sequence of notes one realizes that true musical appreciation has already transcended the sequence. One would be at the animal level if it were not so. The work of art so far as it is a work of art, is beyond the temporal.

In ethics, an analogous relationship holds good. Moral conduct is a sequence of cause and effect; in the circumstances that make the hero ready to risk his life for others, there is a temporal sequence, but of course the heroism is out of time. The general act of heroism is *above mere time*, though it has to occur in time. Each one of us has to think all this out for himself, we cannot learn it from books. We have to discipline ourselves and so purify our powers of appreciation, and that is what I mean when I say that we should examine ourselves as fully as we can if we are to get an adequate view of what is meant by personality.

You may object that I have never told you what personality is, and have made my lecture very uninteresting by leaving out just the sort of things that the world calls personality, viz. the individualism of people who get their photographs in the paper and in other like ways make themselves prominent. To my mind that is not personality at all—that is a move-

ment in the opposite direction. Personality is within these values which we have been describing and passes through them to enrich the higher or the more profound religious attitude. It takes one beyond time and beyond the limits of the individual, and that is what I mean when I say that personality is in the end transcended in the Absolute or God, and that there is only one complete personality. We partake of these values; they are revealed to us gradually. We learn to get into relationship with them. We find that the more sincere we are the more able we are to get into relationship with them. We find that what is meant by faith is conviction of our personal participation in these values, and what prevents us from having faith is ourselves. A person has no faith in himself because he knows that he is not sincere. To the extent to which we are not sincere we lack faith, and our sight is blinded, and we move away from the vision of true reality. So far as we are vouchsafed that vision of ultimate reality, we can only get it as parts of one another and of the totality of things. In the end it is the totality of things that is real, and not ourselves. We have reality only so far as we are parts of the totality.

This is all so very obvious that it is difficult to understand why anyone should object to this theory of the absolute, of God the be-all and the in-all. We are members of one family, families are parts of one another, we are all brothers and sisters, we feel that unity of action for the sake of the totality of humanity must be the right action, not merely in the ethical sense, but in the true metaphysical sense, bringing us nearer to the ultimate meaning of things. Looked at from that point of view, pathology takes a wider scope. We are all of us pathological, not only in the sense of showing tendencies to psycho-neurosis or

psychosis, but in the more general sense of being blinded in our insight, being cut off, being obsessed by our individuality, not going out sufficiently smoothly into touch with the totality of existence around us. That going out is not a vague mystic thing, but something definite. We have relationships to those nearest to us, our family is relatively more important to us because we know more of it, and our knowledge helps us to act more effectively and truthfully, and our action must shade off as it covers a larger and larger radius, but we cannot put the circumference anywhere. We must take as our ideal and stretch out our lives to include the totality of existence. This does not mean absorbing totality into ourselves, but getting absorbed into it—not a form of disintegration, a sinking into the Nirvana of nothingness, but living the life of the universe so far as we can throughout our lives. From that point of view “death does not count.” It is a physical experience, generally involving a certain amount of pain and anguish, but as a reality we can pass beyond it, before we face it we can see it as something that is just incidental, and when it does come it only affects the lowest level of our nature. We are people living on a different plane altogether from the plane of mere physical life and death. And so far as we get that totality, and sustain it to any length of time, we feel the question of individual survival after death is wrongly stated. We are already, in this life, in relation to eternal existence. We can partake of that eternal existence. We may, and probably all do, think that immortality or continued existence of some sort is probable, but whatever reasons we have for thinking that are derived from the eternal characteristics of experience, not from the temporal characteristics of experience. So long as we think of existence temporally in terms of sensation and

association, we are bounded by mortality. When we die our sense organs and our brains disintegrate. It is not that kind of existence which is immortal. Memory may be a different matter. This is a difficult problem—the question of how far memories are associated with and dependent on our brains and disappear when our brains disappear. It may be that brain activity is responsible for the recall of memories but not for their retention, and that so-called loss of memory is only a failure in the power of recall.

The poets are nearer the truth than any prose writer and when Browning says "The soul doubtless is immortal where a soul can be discerned" he really gives us the truth. We shall survive so far as we deserve to survive, to the extent to which human nature as such is capable of transcending the conditions of merely temporal physical existence. Although much of the work of the Psychical Research Society, the Spiritualists &c is important in the effort to obtain empirical evidence of survival one cannot say that the results hitherto reached are particularly impressive or cheering because in their triviality they seem to tie one down too much to a merely temporal sequence. The evidence such as it is may be valid but it is not inspiring. The loss of loved ones and the longing for reunion with them is a legitimate and powerful motive for our quest. But apart from this why think too much about another life? We have our reality here. Let us realize the scale of values seek always the highest good strive for that and the rest is in the hands of the Absolute. It seems to me that this is the best temper of mind in which to lead one's life. Live immortally as far as possible now, as Aristotle said so long ago—live the immortal life at every moment. See things from that angle and live one's experience

THE WAY OF THE SPIRIT: (a) IN THE INDIVIDUAL

(ii) By Miss EVELYN UNDERHILL.

OUR subject for this afternoon is the way of the Spirit in the individual, especially as seen in religious experience. In other words—how the Creative Spirit of God deals with our souls, and what we learn of this from the reports of those who are generally called mystics, that is to say, people with an intuitive consciousness of communion with God of the fullest and deepest kind. And as it is always well in dealing with these matters, and handling the abstract terms which we are compelled to use, to be absolutely clear about what these terms mean for us; I say at once that for the term "Holy Spirit" I adopt the definition of St. Thomas Aquinas. I mean, as he said we ought to mean, just "God Himself, inasmuch as He is in all things everywhere and always"; and by "mystical experience" I mean a first-hand conscious experience, however dim and difficult to communicate, of this living, loving, changeless, everywhere present God.

Now our point of departure is this. We, as Christian theists, are committed to the belief that the Eternal Living God is within and around us; moulding and conditioning us all the time, whether we are aware of it or not. Normally, we are not aware of this; but in what is called religious experience, it seems that we are aware of it more or less. The field of normal consciousness is then so expanded or so deepened that it includes this mysterious certitude of communion with God. This experience is not evenly distributed. The majority

from that angle. It is to the extent to which we do that, that we are persons. Yet personality itself is appearance rather than complete reality. In this view I am following F. H. Bradley's view. However much he has been criticized, that central position of his seems to me to be literally unassailable. Intellectually we are forced to think in terms of one—intellect means that, and spiritually we are forced to think in terms of one—spirit means that. Spirit means unity with something that is all inclusive and is perfect, so far as we can appreciate perfection at all. Our imperfections of all kinds come from separates from being separated off from one another. We have to be separated from one another, because each has to do his own work, and no two persons have the same work to do, but this separation is according to an all inclusive law, joining persons up so that the separation is only justified so far as it is an aspect of union. And that brings one to a form of mysticism, but it is not the mysticism of the spiritual sybarite who seeks pleasant feelings as such, but the satisfaction of the most central and also most all inclusive characteristics of one's mind. And that is what the higher mysticism is. In the higher mysticism, which may be more pronounced in some conditions of mind than in others, the experience itself is other than mere emotion. It is the feeling of peace, of complete safety and satisfaction, the feeling that there is perfection, a conviction that perfection, i.e. God, exists and that we may in however humble a way participate in that perfection and thus, and only thus, achieve realization of our inmost personality.

Note—This Paper appears as Chap. XXI: Personality and Value in the *Author's Mind and Personality*. The University of London Press Ltd.

universe, can only be revealed to human beings through some human consciousness. How then are we to think about all this? How is the link made between man's finite and imperfect spirit, and the Holy perfect, and infinite Spirit?

Now it seems to me that the first thing we have to get clear in our attempts to think about this great mystery, is the absolute priority of God's action over man's action. The words of St. John, "We love Him because He first loved us," contain the whole of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in so far as it applies to religious and mystical experience. The fact that the world is never without men and women

of a hazel nut," and how she looked at it with the eye of her understanding, and thought "what may this be?" And it was answered generally thus "It is all that is made." And then she continues "In this little thing I saw three properties. The first is that God made it. The second is that God loveth it. The third is that God keepeth it; but what is to me verily the Maker and the Keeper and the Lover, I cannot tell."

Now there, I think, you have the scene set within which the soul of the mystic experiences God. And you see how the whole emphasis falls on God's Reality, and not merely on the soul's personal experience. You see, too, how chary is the true mystic of claiming any definite knowledge. They find and feel God, but dare not define Him: "by love," they say, "He is gotten and holden, but by thought never." Juhan sees for certain the fact of God, creating, loving and upholding all that is made. But when it comes to saying what this tremendous reality means to her own little soul, words fail her. Yet, in spite of this awestruck failure of expression, she and her brothers and sisters of the spiritual life do contrive to tell us something; and that something is valid as far as it goes. The great hints and records of communion with God which we get from the saints do for us, at the very least, what the creations of a great artist can do. They assure us by their note of certitude and humble delight that there is indeed a truth and beauty still beyond our span which they have really seen and are trying to translate. Whether it is St. Paul calling upon his converts "to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and depth and length and height"; or St. Augustine suddenly exclaiming: "Oh Beauty so old and so new, too late have I loved you!" or St. Francis of Assisi, "My God and All! What art Thou and what am I?" or the exclaim-

universe, can only be revealed to human beings through some human consciousness. How then are we to think about all this? How is the link made between man's finite and imperfect spirit, and the Holy perfect, and infinite Spirit?

Now it seems to me that the first thing we have to get clear in our attempts to think about this great mystery, is the absolute priority of God's action over man's action. The words of St. John, "We love Him because He first loved us," contain the whole of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in so far as it applies to religious and mystical experience. The fact that the world is never without men and women who care supremely about God, and who declare themselves to have experienced Him, is surely *inexplicable unless the Holy and Personal Spirit of God does both transcend and indwell all life, and never ceases to love, attract, and mould human souls*. That to which all the mystics witness with what one of them called "holy marvelling delight," is just this profound concern of God with individual human lives, His intimate, attracting and transforming work on that mysterious thing we call human personality. Although the spiritual life involves real effort and perseverance yet they feel all is occasioned and supported by God. They all say, with St. Augustine, "Thou art the love wherewith the heart loves Thee," and their experience always seems given by Him, and not attained by them. They insist that they cannot get it by any mere effort of their own. It is, as they say, an *infused* knowledge, and carries with it the assurance that there is a distinct supernatural world, which can and does reveal some of its secrets to the loving and desiring heart of man.

Julian of Norwich, in her *Revelations of Love*, tells how she was "shown a little thing, the quantity

of a hazel nut," and how she looked at it with the eye of her understanding, and thought "what may this be?" And it was answered generally thus "It is all that is made" And then she continues "In this little thing I saw three properties The first is that God made it The second is that God loveth it The third is that God keepeth it, but what is to me verily the Maker and the Keeper and the Lover, I cannot tell"

Now there, I think, you have the scene set within which the soul of the mystic experiences God And you see how the whole emphasis falls on God's Reality, and not merely on the soul's personal experience You see, too, how chary is the true mystic of claiming any definite knowledge They find and feel God, but dare not define Him "by love," they say, "He is gotten and holden, but by thought never" Julian sees for certain the fact of God, creating, loving and upholding all that is made But when it comes to saying what this tremendous reality means to her own little soul, words fail her Yet, in spite of this awestruck failure of expression, she and her brothers and sisters of the spiritual life do contrive to tell us something, and that something is valid as far as it goes The great hints and records of communion with God which we get from the saints do for us, at the very least, what the creations of a great artist can do They assure us by their note of certitude and humble delight that there is indeed a truth and beauty still beyond our span which they have really seen and are trying to translate Whether it is St Paul calling upon his converts "to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and depth and length and height", or St Augustine suddenly exclaiming "Oh Beauty so old and so new, too late have I loved you!" or St Francis of Assisi, "My God and All! What art Thou and what am I?" or the exclaim-

ation of Pascal in his wonderful hour of enlightenment, when he was caught and overwhelmed by the consciousness of God, "Certitude! Joy! Peace! Joy! Joy! Tears of joy!" or St Teresa's sudden, vivid little saying "Not to be sure that He was present was impossible to me" Such reports as these all have a strange convincing note, they do carry with them a certain guarantee of objective reality When we have criticized them, as we ought to do, when we have made every allowance for the fragmentary, oblique and symbolic form in which news about the supernatural world must be conveyed to us, who are still creatures of sense, when we have taken off the full discount for auto suggestion, sub conscious activity, disguised desires, projection, and all the rest of it, still, when psychology has done its worst a solid core of experience does remain, which points beyond the world to a given Reality The mystics in fact are the great experimental theists, and as such they have a definite part to play in the religious history of the race

What then have these experimental theists to tell us? Three things we want to know first, what the essence of their experience is, whether its various forms have anything in common, and if so what?—its objective character And, secondly, why and how the experience is given Thirdly, with what result It is obvious that these questions can only usefully be asked of those who have had the experience, and the substance of what they tell us seems to be this First, that mystical experience assures the soul, however dimly yet most certainly, of the eternal perfection, distinctness, and actualness of God It gives what thought requires, an experience of Eternal Life As St Augustine put it of 'something which is insusceptible of change' It lifts the soul past all the slushy pantheisms and

immanentisms, all sloppy and arrogant notions about man being so divine that he has only got to open his cupboards and get out the treasures they contain. Past all that, to a humble adoring contact with supernatural Reality—not as a mere Becoming, a suffering or a self evolving God—for these conceptions are due to a mere confusion of thought—but as the fullest achieved Perfection, a rich simplicity and plentitude. All the mystics dwell with awe and worship on the contrast between the holy reality of God and their own state.

And as regards the second point, this experience seems to be given as a call to the self to fresh levels of life and of activity. It is not self complete, it is a starting point. God then shows the human soul the further possibilities before it, discloses fresh levels of existence, reveals fresh obligations of work and of love, requiring its co operation at every point. Mystical experience has at its onset a conversional character, it begins the process of initiating the growing soul more and more deeply into the spiritual life of love and prayer. "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, *that* we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify thy Holy Name." That ancient prayer of the Church puts in a nutshell the nature and object of God's self communication to the soul.

And as regards the third point, the result of this experience and the life of prayer to which it leads, is, in the terse expression of the New Testament, "a new creature", but a new creature for which much of the old material is cleansed and used again.

Taking these three points together, the assurance of Eternal Life, the change in the self's orientation, and the making of a new personality characterized by creative power and selfless love—to put it in a

phrase, Revelation, Vocation, and Consecration—we can see that the mystics have their part to play in the mysterious economy of that supernatural world, some hints of which religion unveils to us. From them come all our knowledge of its achieved richness, perfection and joy. They are the great teachers of the loving kindness and delightfulness of God; that mysterious give and take between His Spirit and man, by which human personality is transformed and changed. And, in all such give and take, of the fundamental fact that the Divine action comes first. Since we are finite, those ultimate values which convey something of the Infinite and Eternal must be given or infused; and the mystics and those who know the secrets of contemplative prayer have been convinced at first hand of this great truth. God's impact on the soul always seems to them to involve, first, a gift, next a demand, and last the response and transfiguration of that soul; and this profound sense of something really happening, something done to it and to be done by it, sharply marks off all true religious experience on one hand from vague spiritual feelings, on the other from those changes in man, and discoveries by man, which merely develop from within: marks off, in fact, the work of nature from the work of grace.

We could illustrate this from every age of religious history. Thus when Isaiah "sees the glory of God in His Temple" that sudden majestic vision of reality brings with it awe and abasement. He, the faulty human creature, is overwhelmed by a sense of shame and imperfection over against that Perfect Holiness. And this is the preliminary to a painful fiery purification, to his call to service and his eager response. "Here am I, send me." There you have a complete religious experience; singularly free from alien elements. Again, Francis of Assisi, praying in

S Damiano, is 'smitten by unwonted visitations' and finds himself another man than he was before. And at once he seems to hear the voice of Christ saying to him "Francis, repair my house" and "trembling and utterly amazed" prepares to obey. Again, the modern French mystic Lucie Christine says of her first great religious experience, that she suddenly saw with her inward eye the words "God only!" and those words were to her a Light, an Attraction and a Power. She saw truth, she responded to it with delighted love, she received a new dower of energy—the power to live that life of devotion in the world to which she was called. Mind, heart and will were all enhanced.

Now take the three together—the young Jew, destined to be a great prophet, the young Italian, called to revivify the Catholic Church—the young French wife and mother, called to sanctify the simple life of the home through her prayer and love. Are they not all examples of the way of the one Spirit in individual souls? In each case we have the same sequence of awe, vocation, generous unhesitating response—the centre of interest removed to fresh levels—the beginning of a new life, a new career. And in each case, how human and natural, as well as divine and supernatural, this profound experience is! How easily it flows along the channels prepared by historical religion! Isaiah is in the temple, Francis is before the Crucifix, Lucie Christine is meditating on the Imitation of Christ. And indeed the ineffable presence of God is most often actualized by us, creatures of sense as well as of Spirit, not in some abstract and superhuman manner, but by means of those avenues of sense through which we make all our contacts with the world. You remember the wonderful passage in which St. Augustine, one of the greatest masters of

spiritual religion the Church has produced, tries to tell his experience of God.

"What do I love, when I love Thee? not the beauty of bodies, nor the fair harmony of time, nor the brightness of the light, so glad some to our eyes, nor sweet melodies of varied songs, nor the fragrant smell of flowers, and ointments, and spices, nor manna and honey, nor limbs acceptable to embraces of flesh. None of these I love, when I love my God, and yet I love a kind of light, and melody, and fragrance, and food, and embrace, when I love my God, the light, melody, fragrance, food, embrace of my inner man. Where that shines unto my soul, which space cannot contain, and that sounds which time beareth not away, and that is fragrant which the breeze does not dispel, and that tastes sweet which when fed upon is not diminished, and that clings close which no satiety disparts. This it is which I love when I love my God."

You see, he abandons high, philosophic language, and has to use all the five senses in order to get anywhere near it. And he isn't in the least ashamed, or deprecating, about that because he is a genuine saint, a real transfigured human being, in whom the discord between sense and spirit, time and eternity, has been overcome, and who can truly and deeply experience God in simple as well as exalted ways.

And does not this give to us, Catholic Christians whose faith in God and whose access to God are rooted in the Incarnation and the Sacraments, a confidence that we have in the experiences of the mystics not the cloudy imaginings of spiritual freaks, but genuine because humbly conditioned contacts of the soul with His Reality? Don't they assure us of the unity of His action in all its various ways and degrees? Indeed, the nearer we come to an understanding of it, the more we realize that the personal experience of God seen in its most intense form in these mystics, is just a more vivid and penetrating degree of the same experience which institutional religion tries to give us, and theology tries to describe

The vehicles and methods are different. The Reality is the same: the one God and Father of all who is above all in all and with all, first inciting the soul to desire and seek Him, and then along different paths and in different degrees meeting and fulfilling that desire. This is one reason why a genuine religious experience, solid and life-enhancing, usually agrees with and does not contradict—though it often transcends—the general religious tradition. No doubt the best, most balanced and wholesome experience of the contact of the Spirit of God with man's soul would be obtained from within such a supporting tradition; and would be at once intellectual, practical, sacramental and mystical, using and satisfying each aspect of the nature of man. But all these ways cannot be followed equally and perfectly by any one soul. There are diversities of gifts and one Spirit: the mystic, the theologian, the institutionalist, the practical Christian, do not cancel each other out but complete one another. Hence the pure contemplative, like the pure artist, should be regarded as a special type, without which the Church's life would be impoverished, and the purposes of God would lack an essential instrument. Such of His purposes as we have so far actualized can only represent a fragment of His full and perfect will for human life. But the Holy Spirit reaches men through men; and His work in human nature is not only done through the teaching voice or devoted active service. It is also done more silently but far more powerfully along the secret paths of contemplative prayer.

THE HOLY SPIRIT (b) IN THE HOME

(i) By MRS CREIGHTON

THE character of family life has changed in many ways during these last years, but still probably every one would be prepared to grant that the family and not the individual is the unit of society. And it is a strange fact that whilst the right of the individual *to be himself, to live his own life, is insisted upon* with increasing vehemence, the truth that the individual can only realize himself as the member of a community, and that as such he has duties to all other members of the community, is seen with a new force. The family is a commonwealth within the commonwealth of the nations of the world. As each nation must learn the true road to progress, and be stimulated to the higher patriotism by recognizing that it does not exist for itself alone but for the good of the whole family of the nations, so each family must learn to consider itself not as existing for its own good, for its own happiness, but as the training place of future citizens of the state and of the world.

We should, I believe, all agree that the family is the best training place, at any rate for the young, and that it is for the good of the whole, that the parents should have the responsibility of seeing that the children are fully prepared for the responsibilities of life. Yet even though modern thinkers are not prepared to go as far as Plato in giving over to the State the full training of its future citizens, in ever increasing ways the State is encroaching on the functions of the parents as regards education and health. Broadly speaking it may be said that in

the past children were looked upon as the property of their parents, especially of their fathers, and as existing for the good of their parents. The Indian desires a son to offer sacrifices for him after his death; the English parent desired, and in many cases still desires, a son who would work for him in his old age, or carry on the name of a distinguished family. The English mother desired a daughter who would be her companion and helper in the small duties of social and domestic life. Now all this is changed. The modern despot in the family is the child, not the father, parents are supposed to exist for the good of their children, not children to exist for the good of their parents. We need not look back far to see how great the change has been. Some fifty years ago a young parson preaching for a friend in a south country town took as his subject *the responsibility of the elder to the younger generation*, and a good lady of the congregation exclaimed afterwards with indignation "there is no knowing what these young Oxford men will say next, he spoke of the duties of parents to their children, instead of the duties of children to their parents." The old attitude still survives in the use of such phrases as "giving a son to the Church", in the much used allusion during the war to people who gave their sons for their country. In like manner people speak of the sacrifice of parents in allowing their children to go to the mission field, whilst the endeavour of the parents should be to create such an atmosphere in the family that the Spirit may be free to move son or daughter to offer themselves for service whenever the call may come. Yet every missionary society knows of parents who refuse permission at any rate to their daughters, to offer themselves for service abroad. In countless ways the right of parents to control the lives of their

children is still implicitly if not emphatically asserted. The family is still looked upon as a monarchy rather than as a commonwealth. Many contradictory opinions are held as to the nature and extent of the obligations of the different members of the family to one another and to the family as a whole. These no doubt lead often to dissension, and even to acute suffering. But it may be doubted whether the suffering is greater than in the days of despotic rule when complaints could not be uttered and rebellious ideas were suppressed by authority. Parents then had clear ideas as to what their children should be, and brought them up in accordance with these ideas. Now the tendency is for self determination, the spirit which is to rule in the home is the spirit of liberty, individuality is to be released, not suppressed. We believe that this is right, that the object of the parents should be to help each child to realize himself, not to make him conform to a standard set up by others, and whilst he aims at self realization, to reverence the personality of others and respect their individuality. It follows that the ideal home should not be based on authority, but on that ordered liberty in which each will recognize that such discipline as is necessary exists for the common good, and in order to make it possible for the free action of the Spirit to guide each in their work of self determination.

Whatever the elders may think about it, the young at present mean to be independent, and it is clear that the whole character of the relationship between old and young is changing. Indeed, it is hardly possible to exaggerate the greatness of the change, nor how common is the revolt against any form of discipline, and how completely in many circles the young claim the right to manage and control their own lives. This creates a situation in which new problems are constantly arising, and in which the

guidance of the Holy Spirit is specially needed if we would understand them and meet them wisely. It is useless to deplore the situation or to resist it. May it not be both wiser and truer to regard it as liberating new forces, as opening new ways for the Spirit to work.

The war precipitated these changes, the discontent was there before. A young girl naively said to me "I am glad the war has come, it has enabled me to get away from home and do some work." The men who had faced responsibility in the battlefield could not be expected to submit to parental rule. Yet neither young men nor young women were left fit to stand alone, in spite of the big, new experiences through which they had passed, and which their parents had never known. Many of the moral and social difficulties caused by the war resulted just from this fact that the young had not been trained to stand alone. The problem for the present is to adjust the wise use of parental authority and guidance with the development of the capacity to stand alone and order one's own life aright. It is a problem—primarily for the parents to solve, it must be the elders who do most to determine the relations between the old and the young if the inevitable changes are to be worked out harmoniously and not in an atmosphere of revolution. Of course there are those amongst the elders probably the majority, who look back with regret to the old state of things and cling to the old restrictions, just as there are amongst the young those who are eager to claim all the freedom without the responsibility. The impatient young have yet to learn that though liberty may be the prime necessity for life, it is also a burden to bear which needs wisdom and self control. The whole question of the relationship between old and young is not simple or to be solved by a phrase. It is as

complex as any other human relationship. Mr. Tawney has truly said in his recent book that in every human soul there is a socialist and an individualist, an authoritarian and a fanatic for liberty. It is easy to see the injury done by extremist views, but we can only avoid it by seeking to find the truth contained in them.

The individual has to realize himself as he stands alone in the presence of God ; he must seek God for himself ; he must discover the ways in which he is called to serve Him, in which by his life he can set forth God's glory. He cannot cast the responsibility for his failures in this direction upon the community to which he belongs. But whilst valuing his perfect freedom, he must see that his choice of action is constantly influenced by the fact that as the child of God, he is one of a fellowship, and that it is from that fellowship as a whole as well as from each individual member of it that God demands service and worship. So the family as a whole must aim at service and witness of the glory of God. It should in truth be thought of as a little church called to witness by its life and conduct to the Master whom it professes to follow.

Much light, too, is thrown on the question of the relationship between the different members of the family by thinking of the family as a small community within the larger community of the state, and remembering that the state itself is a member of the largest family of all, the world ; and further that the one object of all these different communities should be to build up the kingdom of God. None of the responsibilities involved by membership in each one of them can be ignored. All must be seen in their true proportion ; all must be viewed in the light of the largest. No individual can be ignored ; each needs the fullest development possible for the

good of the whole. The parents, whether father or mother, should have an individual life of their own. They should not, as they often glory in doing, live for their children. They must live to further the work of God's kingdom, and their best service to their children will be the example of their own attitude to life. That attitude is too often determined by fashion, by tradition, by the shibboleths of past generations, by platitudes freely uttered by the would be wise and experienced. To break a way through all these for the free action and new life which the Holy Spirit is always ready to give to those who seek it, must be the work not only of the impetuous young but of the experienced elders. This does not mean that everybody is bound to think out everything anew for himself. But we should try to discover those whose experience is worth trusting, and those who can safely be ignored.

That we have heard said, or ourselves said, anything repeatedly is no proof that it is true. We can test the wise saws of the past and the profound maxims of present educators in the light of their results. Above all we must recognize that times are changing and that we cannot go back. It is faithless only to deplore the changes, our call is to use them and by the guidance of the Holy Spirit to discern in them part of God's great scheme of evolution for the whole human race. In this great scheme parents and children alike have their part to play as fellow workers for the kingdom. They are together seekers of the way, of the truth. What wise parent will not agree that he can learn as much from his children as he can ever hope to teach them. It is as we teach that we learn teachableness and humility, and the teacher who is not humble is sure to be a failure. Parents and children may be learning their lessons in different ways, but unless all alike have the spirit

of the learner, many precious truths will be missed. By blind acceptance of the principles, of the methods of the past, we reach a forced and barren finality, we stop growth and development. There can be no finality in the things of the Spirit. He is always leading us into new truth. There can only be finality and certainty with regard to the things which we seek, in God, in the Way, Jesus Christ, in the method, the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in the goal, the Kingdom of God. We seek a country.

How are we to get the guidance that we need? Is our home such as the Holy Spirit can enter and illuminate without hindrance? If we would have Him come, we must open the way for Him, by prayer, by singleness of purpose. It must be His way that we want for our children, not our own. How much room for self-deception there is here! How many reservations we make almost unconsciously when we ask to be shown the way for our children! We have our own ideal for them, our own views as to what the next generation should be, we are alarmed at the thought of changes, of unexpected developments. But ours is the difficult task of not only strengthening the things which remain, but of reaching forward to the things that are before. We need to have an open mind, ever ready to welcome new truth whilst we test it in the power of the Holy Spirit. We must get rid of fear, fear which plays such a much greater part in our lives than we ever imagine, of prejudice which we are so ready to confuse with principle, of stiff ideas and conventions which, if perhaps most common amongst the elders are to be found even amongst the youngest children. Family life at best presents constant small emergencies, slight conflicts of opinion, small decisions to be made which may lead to big consequences. There are times, though they may be very rare, when authority must be

asserted even by the most liberal minded parent for the good of all. There are vital questions that have to be settled. The fact that it is in the light given by the Holy Spirit that we strive to settle all these, will make itself felt even when no outward prayer is uttered. There are those to whom it will come naturally to pray with their children at such moments. But we need to recognize and respect the reserve of a child, how shy many young people are of their deepest feelings. Parents are shy too, that deep saying about casting pearls before swine should suggest to us that pearls are not things to be lightly scattered, and that it may be as swinish to treat pearls without reverence and throw them recklessly about, as to trample them under foot. People are very different, and parents and children, with their many varying and ever contradictory strains of inheritance, may feel very differently about the deepest things. We cannot play with our children's souls, but if we ourselves constantly seek God's guidance, that will make itself felt even if we do not speak about it.

Of course in the visible and outward life of the family, there should be times set apart for common search for the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Family Prayer must be a real and living thing, yet how difficult it is to make it so. How constantly it is entirely neglected, how frequently when practised it is merely perfunctory, for the good of the servants, a bit of family drill to get the children down in good time. Let us realize what it might be, and pray that the Holy Spirit may find His opportunity there and make it real for us ourselves, so that perhaps through us it may be made real for others.

To have the courage to be real—that is what we must at all times be seeking from the Holy Spirit. To do things, to profess opinions, to uphold standards

for the good of the children or of the servants, not because we believe them to be right and true, leads in the end to disaster. The home has to be the training place for us all, not only for the children, and we all can and should learn from each other. In this training one of the most important things to be learned is not only the responsibility of each for the family life, but the responsibility of the family as a whole to the community of which it forms a part. James Hinton said "the devil comes to an Englishman in the shape of his wife and family," and truly no form of selfishness is so insidious as family selfishness. To this it is the parents who are the most prone and probably the mother especially. The difficulty for us all is to keep the right balance between our various duties. We may deny ourselves to help some great cause, we may live in a world of great ideas and great aspirations and neglect the lonely and tiresome relation, the little distasteful duty close at hand. The priest was no doubt very zealous about his duties in the Temple, very devoted to its glorious worship in which he himself was going to play a splendid part, but he passed by the wounded man who lay by the road side. Self comes in everywhere to help and determine our decisions. Apparently conflicting duties are bound to be a great perplexity at all times. We should not try to save our children the pain of making a decision, nor think we can decide for them. We can only hope to make the atmosphere which will help them and us to make the right decision. Only the Holy Spirit can guide us and sweep away the cobwebs of vanity and self seeking which obscure our view. Too often it is but veiled selfishness that determines our decisions and this is the case alike with parents and children. The devotion of parents, especially perhaps of mothers, can be mere selfishness.

It is often asserted that the attitude of the young

at present, and especially since the war, amounts to a revolution, that the individual parent is powerless to resist the tendency of the age, revolt is in the air, the young are determined to go their own way, to defy authority. We should not try to shut our eyes to the greatness of the change that is taking place. We cannot be too insistent in seeking to understand its meaning. To resist it would be futile. We have to see the good in it, to discover how the evil is to be avoided and to work with the good. Samuel Butler said that it was a pity that the generations overlapped. He spoke with the bitterness of one who considered that he had suffered from the treatment of his elders. Surely the fact that the generations overlap is one of the greatest means of progress. The older generation must hand on what it has learned; the mistake is to hand it on as the final truth. It must be handed on in order that it may be enriched and perhaps modified or even obliterated by the new light that is constantly being revealed to those who are coming after; we are told that it is the young who see visions. We are all, in so far as we have any purpose at all, working towards the light. In that great pursuit the gifts, the contributions of all are needed. It is comradeship between the generations that we should desire, not rivalry nor antagonism. Comradeship does not mean that the contributions of each to the common task will be similar. The elders are first in the field, though this is an advantage through which they will lose if they try to make too much of it, if they try to assert it on all occasions. They may believe that they have a claim on the gratitude of the young, but there is really no answer to the question sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously put by the young, "Why should I owe you gratitude? You brought me into the world for your own pleasure, I did not ask to come." This claim is as absurd as

any other claim for gratitude. Gratitude is a gracious gift which should be given gladly and spontaneously, it should never be demanded nor even expected. Family life really presents on a small scale the same problem as the state. We have to learn how to combine liberty with democracy, order and discipline with opportunity for each to develop on their own lines. The relations between young and old cannot be so simple as they were in the past when the old ruled supreme. It is this new idea of relationship on the lines of fellowship, of comradeship in the pursuit of a common goal, of liberty for each combined with a willing acceptance of discipline for the common good, that we have to leave the Spirit free to work out and help us to apply in the regulation of our family life. We have to accept the inevitable changes in the spirit of hope and to remember how easy it is to see only what was beautiful in the past and to overlook or refuse to see what was imperfect or even evil.

At present there is a tendency to fuss much too much about the young. They are being treated and spoken of almost as if they were a caste, even if we do not go so far as to treat them as untouchables. We isolate them, we plan separate organizations of all kinds for them, and we grieve when they refuse to fit into the organizations which we create. We watch and notice and criticize, but though we may persuade ourselves to the contrary, that does not mean that we understand. We generalize from our imperfect observation and so the young, like the working classes or our domestics or the profiteers or those we speak of as "the poor," really become a caste in our thinking. We generalize about them but we do not understand them. We forget that the important thing in all our relationships is to recognize our common humanity and to honour it and that this is not easy. The Spirit cannot move freely and bring

us all together owing to the barriers that we erect. We must ask His aid to throw down these barriers.

I do not deny that this is a time of great, far reaching and often painful changes, and that much which seemed to us the very foundation of family life is being shaken and roughly questioned. It is not a time in which it is easy for those who think, to see clearly. Perhaps we elders when we look back with regret to the cultured leisure, to the comfortable prosperity, to the well ordered homes of Victorian days, do not sufficiently realize what a difficult time this is being for the young. There is disillusionment in the air, everything is being questioned. We see the immense need for hard steady work, and some of the young ask "Why should I work?" and others "what is the good of any work? What purpose is there in life at all?" and they go on to drown thought in a feverish rush after pleasure, which leaves them still unsatisfied. Yet there are plenty of signs of their capacity for response to any real call, as quick and ready as was the response in those first days of the war. What they need is the inspiring call, the leader who will show them the great cause. We need prophets and there seems to be no word from the Lord. Meanwhile we elders must do our best to clear away the obstacles the blindness, the fears, the prejudice which prevents the rush of the Spirit's life. We must give what leadership we can, not so much by trying to point out special work to be done or the need for hard work, as by the courage with which we do our own work, by the way in which we regard it, by our joy in it by our constant effort to press forward. The war has shaken us up and left us broken and bruised, it is natural that we should feel too tired to go into new ways. But our Master's voice still rings out the call to go on in hope. He said "Behold I make all things new." Shall we

be afraid? Shall we fail Him? The young, it is true, will make the new world, but they need our help. In this glorious and exacting enterprise all must work together in true co operation, and it is in the common wealth of the family that the power to work together may be learned if we will seek the way. We cannot find the way for our children, the most we can do is to help them to find it for themselves. We can help or hinder them most by what we are ourselves. Christ left us not a set of precepts but a life to guide and inspire us, in our dim way we must try to be like Him and remember that the example of a single-minded and sincere life is the best gift we can give our children. We must be prepared for disappointment. Our children may not turn out as we want, they may make grievous mistakes, we cannot always shield them from the results of their own actions but we can aim from the first at making them realize their own responsibility. In the end it is they who must fashion their own lives, but our love and patience and understanding should be such as to make them know that we shall never fail them, and the blessing may be ours of seeing that the family bond strengthens as the years go on, even though it binds together men and women of very different aims and pursuits. In their very diversity they will recognize a unity which transcends all differences and by those very differences they will gain a fuller understanding of that wonderful world in which the Spirit moveth where it listeth, and in His own way, brings us all into that unity which can only be found in God Himself.

THE WAY OF THE SPIRIT (b) IN THE COMMUNITY

(ii) By the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER

As we study the New Testament with mind set on learning all that we can from that normative period of the Church's life concerning the Holy Spirit, it seems to me that three things stand out, partly perhaps by contrast with what we should find if we were to study most of the writings that could be taken to represent the experience of Christians in almost any other generation, certainly in our own. One thing that so stands out by contrast is the immense prominence given to the person and activity of the Spirit. To be a Christian is to be possessed by the Spirit, to be filled with the Spirit. It is sometimes said now by clergy that they find Whitsuntide the hardest of all great festivals on which to preach. If that is so, then it partly shows how very far our experience has travelled from what was the normal experience of the first Christians and there must be some lack there that needs to be made up. Secondly, we find again what I don't think would be reflected in utterances spoken and written to day unless they were the work of scholars meditating on the New Testament. The sureness of the presence of the Spirit always means fellowship and the supreme mark by which He may be known is fellowship. He manifests Himself in fellowship. That does not, of course, mean that He is not represented as dwelling in individuals, far from it, but He never dwells within individuals without also welding them together in one, and as to be a Christian and to be filled with the Spirit are synonymous expressions, so in the New

Testament to be filled with the Spirit and to be a member of the Church or of the Body of Christ are synonymous expressions. And the third point, where the contrast, no doubt, would be much less, is the conviction that this power which is known under the distinctive name of the Holy Spirit is only fully known by those who have received the revelation of the love of God in Jesus Christ and have in some measure, at least, opened their hearts to respond to it. Christians know the Holy Spirit in the fullness of His power because God by the Incarnation—that is by the revelation of Himself in a human life which we can understand and with which we can sympathize—has won a new kind of power over our hearts and wills. There was always the power of the Creator over His creation and always the power of Him Who is, in His own person, the moral law over the consciences of the beings whom He had made in His own image, capable of responding to the claim of duty. There was always the power derived from expectation of reward or fear of penalty. There was not, in anything like the same degree, this power, the greatest of all powers over human conduct, of winning out an answering conviction and sympathy through the manifestation of love in an intelligible form. That came with the Incarnation and it is partly, at least, because the Incarnation was just that, that it was the means through which the coming of the Spirit in that power familiar to the early Church and known to the Church ever since was able to be given. And so there comes a tendency to set up a rather sharp contrast between the Church and the world, between that which is and that which is not the sphere of the Spirit. And we must recognize the grounds of that contrast and give them their full weight. We can hardly remind ourselves too often that the New Testament virtually confines the expression “Children

of God" to those who have known and responded to the revelation of God's love in Jesus Christ. It asserts very strongly that God is the Father of all, which implies that all are His children, but it only gives the title of "children" as a rule to those who are so to speak made worthy of the position of children, who have realized and taken an interest in this revelation which itself has been made possible to them through the opening of their hearts by the appeal of the love of God in Christ made to them. All this is true, and it must remain the fact that the normal channel of the Holy Spirit's activity in the fullness of His power is the Church, because the Church is the society of those who have received the revelation of God in human life to which a human answer can be given. The moment we have said that, we need to go on and supplement it by the reflection that the world into which Christ came was not an alien world but His own world, a world in the creation of which he was Himself the agent, and that what we know in all its fullness through Jesus Christ is that which, less known, was, after all, at work in all the world before and is at work in all the world now, outside the confines of the Christian Church. Only within the Church, it may be, can the power be realized in all its fullness but it is the same power that is elsewhere at work. It is that thought that, most of all, as it seems to me, helps us to obliterate the sharp distinction between Church and world which, if pressed hard, will leave us as Mr Barry was pointing out in this Congress, with a conception of religion rather thin and empty, for we shall have reduced it to that which must always indeed be the mainspring and breath of its life—worship—but we shall have removed from it the sphere in which that life is to be worked out—service in the redemption of the world. And so one of the things we must

claim very insistently and with quite deliberate and conscious purpose is that wherever we find the fruits of the Spirit there the Spirit is at work, and that wherever we find the fruits of the Spirit there is something which only the Church can properly interpret and which only the Church can bring to its true destiny and goal. So, for example, as we hear the world call to the Church we shall desire to assert, not to deny, that the Holy Spirit is active in the other religions of mankind, that His activity there, no doubt, is limited, cramped and confined, but that everything in those religions which tends to lift men above the level which would otherwise be theirs if that religion and all religion were taken from them, is of the Holy Spirit. No doubt there are religions in the world where, striking a balance, so to speak, you might say that His activity is much less than the activity of other spirits. There are religions which are almost entirely dominations of fear, and yet I do not suppose there is in the world any religion which has not in it some aspiration and struggle after good, and wherever we find it that, we shall say, is the Holy Spirit, that aspiration, however misunderstood and however overlaid with other tendencies, really is the power which we know in the Church through the response of Christians to the redeeming love of God in Jesus Christ, so that Christianity is the fulfilment of those religions just as we always believe it to be the fulfilment of Judaism. And when persons, usually proceeding from America, suggest we should hold congresses on religion and arrive thereby at the universal religion which shall be the synthesis of all the existing religions, any Christian who knows what he is about is bound to decline to take part in any such conferences because he is bound to hold his religion is itself already the universal religion and the synthesis of all the rest. Not that the Church is

yet complete or Christianity, as we understand it, is all this; but that Christianity as it was planted in the world by Jesus Christ and will develop into the full-grown tree under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and when all nations come to find their home beneath its shade, will be the fulfilment of all that in all the religions is true and has any promise of satisfaction to the human soul. But supremely in all this and everywhere else we shall note the work of the Holy Spirit as making for fellowship, and here we link on very easily to the last subject. We have been rightly reminded that the unit of society is not the individual but the family, and the isolated human individual, we shall probably agree with Aristotle in saying, is either a beast or a god but he is not truly human. Humanity must express itself in some kind of fellowship, and there you get the root of all that mass of considerations which a certain set of psychologists have lately been studying concerning the Group Mind. Wherever you gather people together with any closeness of intercourse something like a group mind begins to appear. They interact on one another in such a way that they become a society even if their relations with one another are relations of intense hostility; and there are people in the world who have been driven into complete misery by the death of some cherished enemy, hostility against whom has become the dominant interest of their lives; and that, after all, is one manifestation of the same kind of effect which you can see worked out into the group mind when fully developed in the form in which psychologists have generally taken it; for when people are gathered together with one predominant purpose among them all, there is a new character produced. It is by no means always better than the character of the individuals who compose that group. That will depend on two things. It will depend,

first, on the level of moral attainment that those individuals separately have reached and upon the nature of the purpose that gathers them together. All men are capable of activity altogether outside their own reach when they act as members of a closely knit society. Mobs are capable of a degree of deliberate and callous cruelty of which their individual members would never dream. A soldier in a regiment who has no conspicuous courage of his own may perform prodigies of valour under the inspiring influence of the corporate spirit which pervades the whole company. Now what we see at Pentecost and what goes on through all the history of the Church is, as it were, the consecration of this group mind by taking it up for the purpose of the Holy Spirit, and it is only through such consecrated group mind that the Holy Spirit can act in the fullness of His power. Not only must there be the hearts that are open to the love of God in Jesus Christ but there must be the union and fellowship of those whose hearts are thus open taken up and brought beneath His consecrating power. At Pentecost you had all the conditions favourable for the kind of experience that forms the basis of group psychology, a group of people living very close to one another under the inspiration of a profoundly impressive memory and in vivid anticipation of something they hardly knew what. Then the great event comes. The fact that we can, to some extent, trace this psychological basis is of course no sort of evidence against its truly supernatural character, for the supernatural is I think, certainly not usually the contradiction of the natural but is the taking up of it into the divine purpose and the using of it for ends beyond those which without the divine power working through it, it could have attained. So we turn to thinking of the movement of the Holy

Spirit in the community otherwise than in the Christian Church itself. What are the marks by which we can recognize His presence? First, I would say, by everything that is indispensable to fellowship. Wherever you find a keen desire for justice there the Holy Spirit is at work, for unless there be justice secure fellowship is hardly possible. Fellowship lifts us indeed far above the level at which consideration of justice is primary, but unless the elementary needs of justice are met fellowship is almost out of the question. This is, of course, most of all true where the desire is justice for others rather than justice to oneself, but if it only be justice for oneself, if the desire is genuinely for justice the Holy Spirit is at work. And when we hear men arraign the present order of society on the ground that it is unjust we may or may not think they are mistaken but we shall not lightly pass by their challenge. The Church must always feel that that challenge must be met in one way or another. It must be shown to be false or the truth in it must be removed, if there is injustice it must go. And similarly where there is a desire for freedom. Freedom, as we have just been told, is not an end in itself, and we know how it can be abused, but without freedom none of the higher reaches of the spiritual life are possible at all. A compulsory virtue is no virtue. There may be a place for discipline, and even a place for coercive discipline, but they are merely, so to speak, to clear the way in order that the free action of the human spirit guided by the divine may press forward along the path which God has marked out for it. And again, wherever we find a movement towards peace we shall know that the Holy Spirit is at work in the hearts of men, for peace again is partly the indispensable basis and partly the outcome of fellowship. So long as actual hostilities go on between nations there can

be no real fellowship among them, while it is also true that peace will only be secured when the true fellowship has been attained. We may agree or disagree with the particular methods by which some people desire to establish the peace of the world. We may think, for example, that the League of Nations is a wise machine to have established or an unwise one. We may think that Pacifism is a true interpretation of Christianity or an erroneous one. Wherever we find an earnest desire for peace there we shall see that, whatever human limitations set hindrance to His work, the Holy Spirit is at work in the hearts of men and we shall welcome these as people who in their hearts are desiring what the Church must also desire because the Church is the home of the Spirit. Wherever these things are, there shall we recognize the power of the Holy Spirit but we shall also remember that He can only show that power fully through those who recognize Him for what He is and submit their wills to His accordingly. Where you find a movement aiming at great ideals but entirely divorced from all real religious faith consciously religious faith there almost certainly you will find that the ideals are not reached and it should be the business of the Church with the completest possible sympathy and with no desire whatever to lord it over those who have thus responded to the Spirit, in some degree without knowing what it is to go and explain to them as far as it is possible, what they are really doing in order that their response may be more free. Simply in order that we may not lose sight of it, let me mention other manifestations of His presence in other fields which have already been alluded to this evening in the aspiration after beauty and truth. When the struggling artist, who has caught some glimpse of beauty to which the minds and souls of his contemporaries are not yet sensitive

persists in presenting that beauty he has seen and will not adulterate his message by what would make his products saleable and is thereby left somewhere near starvation when he could easily make himself rich if he would only degrade his calling—that man is responding to the Holy Ghost. It will be better for him, far better, if he can know it and know of all those other activities of the Holy Spirit so that he may feel how his work is linked up with all the greatest aspirations and enterprises in the world. But what moves him, whether he knows it or not, is the Holy Ghost; and so it is, too, with the scientist, perhaps wearing out his faculties in the laborious pursuit of some minute fraction of truth needed to complete the fabric of science. And we have to learn a new respect for these people in their own spheres beyond what we have usually shown, while they, on their side, we must hope, will learn again to accept the consecration which only religious faith can give. While they and the Church stand apart each is liable to invade the other's territory and then they criticize one another unintelligently. There is a good deal of unintelligent criticism of science by art and religion, and a good deal of unintelligent criticism of religion by science and art. So the Church must not claim a monopoly of the activities of the Holy Spirit, limiting Him to those activities which are conducted in its own name, but will rejoice to acknowledge His activity in all movements which display the fruits of His presence, pointing the adherents of those movements to the source of their inspiration. Now let us consider a few movements in which, as I believe, the power of the Holy Spirit is seen in greater or less degree, so that we may consider also our attitude towards them; and all of them are in some degree group movements. As I have already said, the method of the Holy Spirit is always to take something

which is there by nature, by the divine creation, and raise it to new kinds of activity by the guidance which He offers it, and so it is also in the group mind. Just as when any group of people come together filled with a common purpose, they are fused together into one and without any real loss or any necessary loss of individuality yet express themselves on a fuller and larger scale than they could have done in separation, so it is in the experience of Christians. Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ there arises a group mind, a corporate personality, but it is something more than their group mind, it is something more than the mere union of their personalities, it is Jesus Christ in the midst of them. But this does not happen with others, because other leaders are not themselves the eternal Word of God, the Power of Creation, but here is One who is Himself the eternal Word of God, the God in whom we live and move and have our being so that as the purpose for which we come together is truly His purpose, the personality which is born in us, this unity, is no longer ourselves but is Christ in us, the hope of glory. That should be the characteristic experience of the Church. Let us look at some movements, some outside and some inside the Church and see what we may learn from a very brief and superficial consideration of the features they display to us. We take one great movement of our time. Whatever we think of it, whatever our attitude towards it, none will deny that a leading characteristic of our period of history is the Labour movement. And again, surely, no one who has any acquaintance with it at all will deny the Labour movement is an aspiration after brotherhood. It may be many other things as well, but amongst them it is that. There has never been a political movement which has used brotherhood and fellowship and comradeship as watchwords

in anything like the degree the Labour movement of our time has used them. Yet we are also familiar with occasions on which this cause of brotherhood and fellowship has been advocated in the spirit and with the accents of pugnacity, and when that happens one knows at once something has gone wrong. Here we have a movement whose advocates support it by appeals to the spirit most opposed to that which they value in their own. The same has been true of the Church sometimes. There has been advocacy of the cause of Christ Himself in terms not very far different from contempt and hatred. So we do not note this to sneer in any way but we notice it as a fact and as an indication that something has gone wrong, just as in some activities of the Church it is apparent something has been wrong there too. And we know this Labour movement, as a movement, is not religious. It is a movement after one of the fruits of the Spirit without any conscious or deliberate reference to the Spirit Himself. That will never succeed. Here our chief hope seems to lie in those members of such a movement who are Christians, only the rest of us must help both by showing the bearing of Christianity upon those problems with which their movement is concerned and by showing sympathy towards those aspirations of the movement which are truly Christian. We must remember that Christian members of a movement which is not itself a Christian movement, require very great courage if they are to assert their Christian principles in the face of the other members of such a movement, and they have a right to expect from us deep sympathy, and any support it is possible for us to give them. I pass to another movement also mainly among working people. In the Workers' Educational Association we have a body mainly committed to ideal ends, non-political, aiming at the development

is true we begin to be able to serve these movements and deepen their spiritual qualities. With that must go what is really only another side, the humility which is ready to give without claiming to lead. And that is very hard for those who are convinced that they possess the truth. If convinced we possess the truth, we desire, of course, to bring everybody into agreement with us, adding to ourselves, so to speak, "because it is the truth." That won't do. None of us possess all the truth and we never know to what extent the truth we possess is really vitiated in our own minds by the lack of those parts we don't possess. Only in the whole body of Christ will the whole truth of Christ be manifested. But if we can really be sure we care for the truth because it is the truth and not merely our opinion, then we shall be able to help without claiming leadership and yet without weakening our own conviction; but only on one further condition, and that is, that behind all our efforts to mingle with these movements in the world and to forward their claims when they seem to us right there is the genuine personal consecration of our own spirit which prevents anyone from feeling that as we press the truth we seek we are being self-assertive. It is the self in us that alienates other people, not the truth in us, and in the degree in which we are really consecrated we shall be able, broadly speaking, to commend to all those who are in any way under the influence of the Holy Spirit, that fuller knowledge of Him which is ours and which they may need, because it will not be we that speak but the Spirit of our Father and theirs which speaks in us.

III.

PREPARING HIS WAY : (a) BY THE SERVICE OF PHYSICAL WELFARE (*Personal*)

- (i) By W. E. HENDERSON, M.A., M.B., Ch.B., D.P.H.,
*Medical Officer of Health for Westmorland,
Chief Scout's Commissioner.*

As we approach our theme we do well to recall the petition in the Collect for Whitsunday that it may be granted to us by the Holy Spirit "to have a right judgment in all things." This is a petition for power to exercise and keep in repair the grace of a sense of proportion as we face the age-long problem of the relative claims of the bodily and spiritual elements which enter into the making of human personality.

At one pole we have had the Greek with his cult of the body, at the other the Ascetic with his belabouring of Brother Ass. Some superficial commentators have asserted that Christianity despises the body. We know that this is not so. We know that our Lord "took the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men and being found in fashion as a man." He was for thirty-three years a Tenant of the body. He healed men's bodies on His way to heal their souls. St. Paul assigns to the body the high office of the habitation of the Holy Spirit. He calls us so to prepare our body as to provide hospitality for this "tremendous Lover," not as in some "batter'd caravanserai" as for a casual wayfarer; instead this Holy Guest has to find prepared for Him a Temple, and He to be its Celebrant.

of knowledge and quite consciously concerned with the growth of fellowship through the common aim at knowledge and, at times, I have been conscious of what was undoubtedly genuine spiritual power in its gatherings. But here there is always some appreciation of the Spirit, though not under His proper name nor fully recognized for what He is, but yet a real appreciation of what is the Holy Spirit because it is a movement consciously and deliberately concerned with whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just pure, lovely and of good report—if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, and when St Paul tells us to occupy our minds with those things he is giving us in quite simple language the best lessons of the most modern psychology about the way in which we can prepare ourselves for the power in ourselves of the Holy Spirit. But there is, of course, in that movement again no clear recognition that the spirit of these things the spirit of beauty and the spirit of truth is the Spirit of God and of Jesus Christ whom we must fully receive in prayer, meditation and communion. It has often rather startled me that Church people, both clergy and laity have not helped that movement more than they have done in the past, but if we are to help let us recognize it must be on terms of equal membership and not with any desire to lead. I wish to take another characteristic movement. The Student Christian Movement, a movement definitely and consciously religious and its leadership strongly Christian in the traditional sense. This again calls for great sympathy and help from those who have reached a firmer grasp of Christian truth than its members being students can be expected to have reached and it is a movement of people banded together in the consciousness of allegiance to the supreme Spirit seen in

the desire to work out His will for them in their lives. We come closer into the Church. In the Life and Liberty movement within the Church there was a group effort to obtain for the Church the machinery of corporate freedom and to stimulate the life that should use that machinery to good effect, and it was a movement that rested throughout and in all its stages on prayer. No doubt it made blunders, but it was very sincere, and it achieved within itself a quite astonishing unanimity though it was drawn from every school of thought in the Church. Or, once again, we may think of that movement generally known as Copee, an inter-denominational effort to apply the mind and Spirit of Christ to our social life. Here again were people of the most diverse antecedents and points of view welded together in real fellowship because they were seeking to apply the principles of Christ in conscious dependence upon the Spirit of Christ. Now, out of this, certain things seem to me to emerge. First, the more conscious is our dependence on the Holy Spirit in any movement the greater the unity achieved. Where He is at work but is not recognized, He will not be able to overcome the natural tendencies towards division and separation. There must be the recognition of Him and the conscious dependence on Him if His full activity in creating fellowship is to be realized. Further, the conditions of success in spiritualizing these movements which have some spiritual roots but don't recognize them, are at least these, first, a belief in freedom so that we are ready to see the movement go its own way even when that way is not ours. Our dependence must be on the Spirit and not a desire to use the Spirit to press our own convictions. Our prayer should always be, not that our purpose may prevail or that anybody else's may prevail but that the Holy Spirit may prevail over all of us, and in so far as that

is true we begin to be able to serve these movements and deepen their spiritual qualities. With that must go what is really only another side, the humility *which is ready to give without claiming to lead.* And that is very hard for those who are convinced that they possess the truth. If convinced we possess the truth, we desire, of course, to bring every body into agreement with us, adding to ourselves, so to speak, "because it is the truth." That won't do. None of us possess all the truth and we never know to what extent the truth we possess is really vitiated in our own minds by the lack of those parts we don't possess. Only in the whole body of Christ will the whole truth of Christ be manifested. But if we can really be sure we care for the truth because it is the truth and not merely our opinion, then we shall be able to help without claiming leadership and yet without weakening our own conviction, but only on one further condition, and that is, *that behind all our efforts to mingle with these movements in the world and to forward their claims when they seem to us right there is the genuine personal consecration of our own spirit which prevents anyone from feeling that as we press the truth we seek we are being self assertive. It is the self in us that alienates other people, not the truth in us, and in the degree in which we are really consecrated we shall be able, broadly speaking, to commend to all those who are in any way under the influence of the Holy Spirit, that fuller knowledge of Him which is ours and which they may need, because it will not be we that speak but the Spirit of our Father and theirs which speaks in us.*

III

PREPARING HIS WAY (a) BY THE SERVICE OF PHYSICAL WELFARE (*Personal*)

(1) By W E HENDERSON, M A , M B , Ch B , D P H ,
*Medical Officer of Health for Westmorland,
Chief Scout's Commissioner*

As we approach our theme we do well to recall the petition in the Collect for Whitsunday that it may be granted to us by the Holy Spirit "to have a right judgment in all things" This is a petition for power to exercise and keep in repair the grace of a sense of proportion as we face the age long problem of the relative claims of the bodily and spiritual elements which enter into the making of human personality

At one pole we have had the Greek with his cult of the body, at the other the Ascetic with his belabouring of Brother Ass Some superficial commentators have asserted that Christianity despises the body We know that this is not so We know that our Lord "took the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men and being found in fashion as a man" He was for thirty three years a Tenant of the body He healed men's bodies on His way to heal their souls St Paul assigns to the body the high office of the habitation of the Holy Spirit He calls us so to prepare our body as to provide hospitality for this "tremendous Lover," not as in some "batter'd caravanserai" as for a casual wayfarer Instead this Holy Guest has to find prepared for Him a Temple, and He to be its Celebrant.

PHYSICAL WELFARE

What does the possession of physical well being mean for the individual? It means health. It implies the maintenance of health as a personal responsibility. It means living, in so far as we can, the healthy life, as faithful trustees of a gift from our Heavenly Father.

WHAT IS HEALTH?

Health is something far more than absence of ill-health. It is indeed a great and positive thing. Health means the seeing eye, the hearing ear, the clever nimble hand, the strong right arm, the swinging step, quick wits and a clear head. It means as well the happy buoyant heart, for the person who is for ever whining and complaining, the person who "cultivates the misery habit" is not healthy. His mind is not healthy. The modern conception of health finds its best interpreter in Dr Campbell Macfie, in his book *The Art of Keeping Well*.*

"In its crudest sense," he writes, "health means simply wholth, or wholeness. the word is indeed derived from the same root as whole. But it is also derived from the same root as holiness, and if it is to be used in its modern sense as the most desirable condition of the body, it must be taken to mean much more than freedom from obvious mutilation. It must be taken to connote not merely physical wholeness, but also mental wholeness, and social wholeness, and spiritual wholeness. Man has not only a body, he has also a mind and spirit, he has relations not only with man but with the Maker. A completely healthy man must be whole or wholesome

in all these respects. He must have an efficient body producing a sufficiency of mechanical energy and mental energy, and he must turn these energies to ends making for the welfare of himself and of his fellows, and bringing him to a sense of unity with God."

A sense of unity with God. And is it not the Divine prerogative of the Holy Spirit to bring us to this sense of unity with God?

The maintenance of health, by living the healthy life, by loyal trusteeship of the Creator's gift is not something you can read up in a book. A process is involved, a life has to be lived. The pursuit of health is not an end in itself. It is practised with an objective great and glad in view, namely, the dedication of the body with all its manifold faculties and activities to be the abode of the Holy Spirit. The pity of it is that some people treat the body as though it were a dusty unswept garret, or a mouldy, dingy cellar, too often a beer cellar, but, as we have seen, St Paul reminds us more than once that the body is a Temple to be kept clean, and sweet, and holy.

INDIVIDUAL HEALTH

The password into the garden of health, the key word that helps us to hold on to health is the homely, fireside word "clean"—clean air to breathe, both inside and outside our homes, by night as well as day, clean dwelling houses, clean streets, clean water to drink, clean milk, clean food, clean bodies, clean thoughts.

COMMUNAL HEALTH

It has been well said that "the whole code of Public Health legislation is a proclamation by

Public Authority that man is his Brother's keeper, and that no man liveth to himself alone" If he does, if he is wholly wrapped up in himself, he makes a pretty small parcel As George Gascoigne sang long ago

' O Knights, O Squires O gentle bloods y born,
You were not born all onlie for yourselves '

The individual householder has not only to safeguard his own and his family's health. He must play the game of health in his team of neighbours along his own street, and in his own community. Our health conscience is a very sensitive index of the depth and quality of our citizenship.

THE SERVICE OF PHYSICAL WELFARE

In the service of physical welfare, as seen in operation to day in a progressive community awake and aware to its responsibilities, you will find that one principle in its working faith is—"first things first." We aim at securing worthy parenthood. The older girls at school are given practical instruction in the art of mother craft. It is time we heard more about father craft for the older boys. The Scout and Rover Organization was the first to tackle this in its Healthy Man Badge and Public Health Man Badge training—a training in practical, applied father craft, and the duties and responsibilities of a young householder. The Rover thus comes to realize that health is a gift he has on trust from his Creator, nothing less than what Mr C. E. Montague calls, 'the august and precarious stewardship of the clean blood of a race.'* In the days before the War, in a busy industrial town, in a long street of artisan dwellings was a cottage named the Wigwam. A Scoutmaster,

* *The Right Place* (Chatto & Windus)

alas he is now numbered among the Unreturning Brave, rented this cottage, and installed his older scouts in relays. They lived there and went to their work. They ran that cottage, did the housekeeping, marketing, and cooking, until it shone like the thatched cottage of the poem, which was "spotless, neat and clean." This they did to the hilarious amusement of the housewives along the street until it was discovered what the Scoutmaster was after. He was not training his scouts to be housemaids. He was helping his lads to realize how much a woman had to do in a house so that they might be all the better husbands when they became young house holders.

THE INFANT

We hear much nowadays about the infantile mortality rate, and of how this sorrowful annual casualty list is being reduced by the team work of voluntary and official workers. At this point a higher critic appears on the horizon with his false application of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. He tells us that our efforts, voluntary and official, to save infants' lives run counter to the tenets of the better dead school. To apply the lean doctrine of the survival of the fittest to maternity and child welfare work is not only brutal it is inaccurate. Thousands of babies arrive wonderfully plump and hearty. They do not perish by Nature's contriving but by man's mishandling of child environment and child nurture.

This is not the occasion on which to develop this subject. We can sum up the situation by the remark that just as there are many adverse circumstances which together conspire to kill even one baby,

so there is no single infallible cure-all, no short cut to infant saving. Yet in the last analysis it is the mother herself who is going to save the baby. But that mother must be given the chance to be mated to a healthy and informed husband. She must be given the chance to be a healthy mother, before, during, and after her confinement, an informed mother, living in a healthy home into which come adequate wages, wisely spent. Observe what all this involves. It calls for ante natal medical supervision, for skilled medical and nursing service, and for education. Nay more, it is a question of housing, of economics, and of eugenics. If our critic of the better dead school had his way, if we had a closedown of all our work, if the *Eternal Spirit*, brooding over the waters of healing, no longer inspired us to action, we might hide the grim fact of the infant death rate behind the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. But by no theory known to man can we explain away the damage-rate. What of the children who come staggering through the barrage of the first year of life into toddlerhood, maimed and stunted for life?

THE SCHOOL CHILD

His first day at school is a great day for the child. As Sir William Leslie Mackenzie has it "his holiday from the beginning of time has ended, his duty to the end of time has begun." Yes, but he sometimes comes to school too deaf to hear, too blind to see, too under-nourished, or too under-slept to benefit. Hence we have the medical inspection of school children. At this point still another critic takes the floor. He tells us that the legislation which created

the School Medical Service is grandmotherly, and that it is undermining parental responsibility. This grandmotherly legislation phrase is no new cry. It was hurled at Lord Shaftesbury when, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he set out to rescue immature children of tender years from the mines, the factories, the agricultural gangs, and the chimney sweeps. "Man is a wolf to man," said the Roman poet, but what man has been to the child—and not so very long ago either—cannot bear looking into. Whenever any legislation has been proposed to safeguard mothers' and children's lives this cry of grandmotherly legislation has been heard. Instead of ranking as criticism it is in essence a compliment. After all we are dealing with children, and the majority of grandmothers know a good deal more about children than does an elderly bachelor in the House of Commons.

The fear that modern legislation is undermining parental responsibility is groundless as regards medical inspection of school children. This beneficent measure is doing the exact opposite. It is awakening parents to a very lively sense of responsibility. Tens of thousands of parents have had their attention drawn to the beginnings of disease in their children quite unsuspected by them and have, under skilled guidance, pursued a line of treatment which has restored their children to full health. Medical inspection does not stop at mere treatment of existing defects—the salvage work as it were, it seeks to keep healthy children healthy. Under the inspiring direction of Sir George Newman, Chief Medical Officer of the Ministry of Health and of the Board of Education, the School Medical Service strives not only to control the diseases that rob childhood of its joy, but to liberate the forces that make for health. He would have his Public Health Officers concern

themselves not alone with mortality and death dealing diseases but with vitality as well

"The way of health," writes Sir George Newman, "is not hidden in abstruse science. For wisdom and understanding in this subject grow and develop partly, it is true, out of the growth of medicine, but partly also—and in no mean degree—out of the experiences, habits, aspirations, and morals of the people as a whole, evolving slowly out of their communal consciousness rather than being superimposed, ready made, from above. For medicine is human in application as well as technical, it is moral in claim as well as intellectual. Only a people clean in mind and body, within and without, can withstand 'the pestilence which walketh in darkness', and thus the social and moral standard of a people, its national character, bears relation to its health, and that, and not the medical issue alone, is the decisive factor." And again elsewhere he writes "The State and Local authorities may do much, the medical man may do much, but the fulfilment of their purposes cannot be secured apart from an enlightened public opinion, and a healthy way of life for the individual."

EDUCATION IN HEALTHY LIVING

This enlightening process is in evidence in the primary and secondary schools. There children and adolescents are trained in the habit of healthy living along the lines of the Board of Education Syllabus of Hygiene and Temperance taken in conjunction with their training in physical exercises. The voluntary workers in the Boys' Brigade, the Church Lads' Brigade, the Scouts and Guides and kindred organizations are doing valuable service for the physical welfare of the young adolescent. These organizations

take the unsupervised leisure time of the adolescent—the anxious time for parents between tea-time and bed-time—and fill it with healthful, recreational and educational activities.

Think what it means on the side of health of the all-round variety for a city troop to be scouting and trekking in the open country. Consider the city child in that dim land which, with a vague spasm of pity, we call the slums. Think of his restless, exploring, little body, thirsting for the "glorious liberty of the forest." Biologists tell us that a child lives through his childhood the experiences of his far-away ancestors. This invention of Scouting and Guiding is biologically sound. It is in tune with, has got the wave-length of Nature's growth-craft. It takes the city child back to his lost heritage, for the open country is Nature's nursery. And this invention is psychologically sound, for in its application it is learning by doing rather than by don'ting, for the Scout and the Guide ethic is positive. The ten elements in its law are all positive virtues to strive for and hold on to. As Mr. Morton shows in his book, *Childhood's Fears*,* Scouting and Guiding are excellent examples of what the Psycho-Analysts call sublimation—"the hitching of the wagon-load of the primitive instincts to a star of the first magnitude." The sequence is deep draughts of health-giving air with the scent of heather and bracken in it, then a re-kindling of the lovely grace of wonder, which is more than half-way house to worship. To me this is a preparing of His way.

This enlightening process extends as well to the adult population. (We seem to have been a long time in reaching the adult.) By means of Health Week activities, through the Women's Institute movement, the Mothers' Union, the Wives' Fellow-

* G. F. Morton. (Duckworth.)

ship, and similar agencies, the message of the healthy way of life is being broadcast.

In the name of my colleagues in the Health Service, I gladly take this chance to thank the Clergy and Church Workers for their invaluable help. It is the Clergy who face the bowling first, for Health Week always begins on a Sunday. Then there is the educational work, faithfully and courageously done by the National Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, the Clean Milk Society, the Central Council for Child Welfare, the People's League of Health, and by the British Social Hygiene Council.

If we are true to our definition of health as an all-round wholeness of body, mind, and soul, then the service of physical welfare must concern itself with social hygiene. What is meant by social hygiene? It seeks to treat and control the ravages of the *venereal diseases, for every victim cured is a source of contagion the less*. But this is not its sole objective. It seeks to help the people themselves to keep in control, and to sublimate into socially worthy channels, the imperious primitive instinct of sex.

This instinct is a holy thing. It is God's plan for the perpetuation of the race. It is we mortals who have soiled it. Certain Psycho-analysts have got this sex question completely out of focus. They have mislaid their sense of proportion. For instance, one Freudian zealot has written a book with the amazing title, *The Sex Elements in the First Five Books of Euclid*. The facts of life should be explained reverently, and in a progressive scale, by the parents to the growing child with his endless questioning. While it is right that the adolescent should know what is the physical nemesis in store for the slave of his sexual appetites, yet fear is a poor ethic to employ. On the other hand an appeal to his sense of chivalry, the call to cultivate and exercise the hardy virtue

of self control is a challenge to a lad of spirit. Sublimation is the modern word for a process advocated long years ago by St Paul, the policy of "crowded-out," the mind so garrisoned with things "true, honest, pure, lovely, of good report," that gluttony, and vice, and evil living are, by comparison, seen in their true colours as mean, and base, and petty, not playing the game, treason to the Holy Spirit.

RESTORATION TO HEALTH

Thus far we have considered the measures and methods which make for the maintenance of health. This aspect has been stressed because "the health and physique of the people are a chief asset of a nation," yes, but "disease is its principal liability."* Hence the service of physical welfare concerns itself as well with the restoration to health of those whom disease and disablement have robbed of their health. We now enter the province of curative medicine. We are now among the healers. Some of them we know as the Specialists in Medicine or Surgery—the learned Physician or the dexterous Surgeon. Yet it was a famous specialist—the late Sir Frederick Treves—who said that the healer most worthy of honour was "the lonely man in his gig crossing some rain swept moor to night"—the family doctor. Then there are the Researchers in their laboratories, wresting her secrets from Nature, searching into the intricate alchemy of the human body, and telling us of hormones and of insulin, or of vitamins and the healing power of the ultra violet rays. This is the era of teamwork. The Practitioners in curative Medicine, the Public Health Service, the Bacteriologists, the

* Sir George Newman, *Outline of the Practice of Preventive Medicine* 1926, H.M. Stationery Office

ship, and similar agencies, the message of the healthy way of life is being broadcast.

In the name of my colleagues in the Health Service, I gladly take this chance to thank the Clergy and Church Workers for their invaluable help. It is the Clergy who face the bowling first, for Health Week always begins on a Sunday. Then there is the educational work, faithfully and courageously done by the National Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, the Clean Milk Society, the Central Council for Child Welfare, the People's League of Health, and by the British Social Hygiene Council.

If we are true to our definition of health as an all-round wholeness of body, mind, and soul, then the service of physical welfare must concern itself with social hygiene. What is meant by social hygiene? It seeks to treat and control the ravages of the venereal diseases, for every victim cured is a source of contagion the less. But this is not its sole objective. It seeks to help the people themselves to keep in control, and to sublimate into socially worthy channels, the imperious primitive instinct of sex.

*This instinct is a holy thing. It is God's plan for the perpetuation of the race. It is we mortals who have soiled it. Certain Psychoanalysts have got this sex question completely out of focus. They have mislaid their sense of proportion. For instance, one Freudian zealot has written a book with the amazing title, *The Sex Elements in the First Five Books of Euclid*. The facts of life should be explained reverently, and in a progressive scale, by the parents to the growing child with his endless questioning. While it is right that the adolescent should know what is the physical nemesis in store for the slave of his sexual appetites, yet fear is a poor ethic to employ. On the other hand an appeal to his sense of chivalry, the call to cultivate and exercise the hardy virtue*

of self control is a challenge to a lad of spirit. Sublimation is the modern word for a process advocated long years ago by St. Paul, the policy of "crowded-out," the mind so garrisoned with things "true, honest, pure, lovely, of good report," that gluttony, and vice, and evil living are, by comparison, seen in their true colours as mean, and base, and petty, not playing the game, treason to the Holy Spirit.

RESTORATION TO HEALTH

Thus far we have considered the measures and methods which make for the maintenance of health. This aspect has been stressed because "the health and physique of the people are a chief asset of a nation," yes, but "disease is its principal liability."* Hence the service of physical welfare concerns itself as well with the restoration to health of those whom disease and disablement have robbed of their health. We now enter the province of curative medicine. We are now among the healers. Some of them we know as the Specialists in Medicine or Surgery—the learned Physician or the dexterous Surgeon. Yet it was a famous specialist—the late Sir Frederick Treves—who said that the healer most worthy of honour was "the lonely man in his gig crossing some rain swept moor to night"—the family doctor. Then there are the Researchers in their laboratories, wresting her secrets from Nature, searching into the intricate alchemy of the human body, and telling us of hormones and of insulin, or of vitamins and the healing power of the ultra-violet rays. This is the era of teamwork. The Practitioners in curative Medicine, the Public Health Service, the Bacteriologists, the

* Sir George Newman, *Outline of the Practice of Preventive Medicine*, 1926, H.M. Stationery Office.

Biologists, and the Psycho-Therapists are joining forces in an advance on a wide front against the captains of the men of death" Thus we find this team engaged not only in the prevention and treatment of infectious disease, but in the prevention and treatment of non infectious disease, as for instance, rheumatism, heart disease, mental disease, dental disease Nor is the selection of this test team completed There comes a call for the Physician of the Soul from no less a representative member of the Medical Profession than the President of the British Medical Association Dr Hoggarth, in his Presidential address at Nottingham last July, said —

Between religion and nature, between mind and body there exists not an opposition but a relation Every medical man of experience must have known cases in which his own scientific skill has seemed to be helped sometimes most strangely and wonderfully by some serenity of mind in the patient some quiet confidence in the ultimate issue some realization of sure dependence of the soul upon a higher power some tranquilizing influence of the soul upon the physical stress and tumult of the senses—beneficent soothing healing activities in which he and his art have had little or no share

I say with confidence that any systematized creed which professes to dispense with the art of medicine and surgery is false to the divine But if any possess the precious gift of ministering to the mind diseased or of imparting to those who walk in the shadow of the valley the courage to move serenely among the phantoms and terrors which haunt that road let us be sure that so divine a gift can only emanate from a divine source and let us welcome the help of any unseen wings that stir the air with healing

Is not that "so divine gift" a gift from the Holy Spirit? Are not these wings the wings of the Holy Spirit brooding over the waters of healing?

And then there is the splendid Nursing Service. We think of the Nurse in the long wards of our Hospitals, or of the Nurse in the district, climbing

the endless stairs of tenement dwellings, or facing the stinging sleet sweeping across her track to some lonely farm-house.

There are, too, for remembrance, the voluntary Hospitals and their generous supporters.

Behind all this work for the maintenance of physical welfare, and the restoration to health, informing all this work, inspiring the workers, there is, I firmly believe, the Holy Spirit, preparing His way by the Service of Physical Welfare. What an honourable calling! "Pioneers, O Pioneers"

III

PREPARING HIS WAY (a) BY THE SERVICE OF PHYSICAL WELFARE (*Environment*)

(11) By Capt R L REISS,

*Chairman of the Executive of the Garden Cities
and Town Planning Association*

No Christian can admit that environment *determines* character. But equally, no Christian can deny that environment *affects* character in so far as it determines the nature and fierceness of the struggle, and creates conditions and temptations which the weaker personalities find it difficult to overcome. I am fully aware that heroic and saintly lives are often lived under the least satisfactory conditions and equally, that the best environment does not necessarily produce the best people—"The West end is not necessarily the best end." Yet for Christian people to tolerate bad environment for other people is to make the struggle fiercer and to place additional obstacles in the way of their leading Christian lives.

The main factors in environment in so far as they are the product of human activity in the past and can be changed by human effort in the future are

- (a) Housing conditions
- (b) The planning of the town generally, particularly the relation of industrial to residential areas
- (c) Facilities for outdoor and indoor recreation
- (d) What may broadly be termed the relation of urban and rural life

Let us consider briefly existing conditions and their physical and moral effects

Since the war considerable attention has been devoted to the housing problem. In the early years following the Armistice the conscience of the public

was stirred by the spectacle of large numbers of demobilized soldiers and sailors returning to live with their families under overcrowded conditions in slum houses. The attention both of Parliament and of Local Authorities was directed to trying to improve these conditions and during the last five years there has been a considerable amount of activity directed towards the provision of new houses. Recently, however, many people have begun to think that the housing problem, if not actually solved, is rapidly nearing solution. Unfortunately this is far from being the case.

In 1919 the Local Authorities estimated that the shortage of houses was approximately one million in Great Britain and many housing reformers regarded this as a serious underestimate. During the succeeding seven years slightly over half a million new small houses have been constructed. About half of these have been built by Local Authorities to let, the remainder being built by various forms of private enterprise for sale.

While this contribution to the solution of the problem has gone a long way towards satisfying the needs of those engaged in clerical employment and of a considerable proportion of the better paid artisans, the working class housing problem as a whole is more serious to day than it was even in 1919. This is due to the fact that about 100,000 new houses are required annually to meet fresh needs, due to the increase in population and the gradual wearing out of the older houses. The production of half a million new houses has, therefore, barely met the annual needs, much less made any contribution to making up the shortage of houses. It is true that during the last couple of years houses have been built at the rate of 140,000 annually, but the greater proportion of these have been houses for sale, and,

therefore, have not affected to any considerable extent the working class housing problem

The effect of this statistical problem in terms of actuality may be illustrated in almost any industrial town. Cases of husbands and wives and three to eight children living entirely in a single room are common. Thus in Gateshead in 1921 one-eighth of all the families were living entirely in single rooms. In Birmingham in June, 1923, the Corporation had on its books 11,600 applicants for houses and fresh applications were pouring in. In his last Annual Report, Sir John Robertson the distinguished Medical Officer of Health for that city, gives some interesting facts regarding housing.

In order to test the degree of overcrowding he had an intensive investigation made of two representative areas each containing about 500 houses the one a poor area the other an artisan area. While there was comparatively little gross overcrowding in the artisan area, the conditions in the poor area were terrible.

He gave instructions that the test of overcrowding should be on a very low basis i.e. overcrowding should only to be recorded where either more than four persons were sleeping per bedroom or where persons of opposite sexes over the age of 13 had to occupy the same room. On this basis one quarter of the houses were overcrowded and in no fewer than 107 out of 527 houses investigated was the separation of the sexes over 13 years of age impossible. In Sheffield the shortage of houses was estimated in 1919 at 20 000 and the number of working class houses built since then amounts to less than one-fifth of that number. As an example of the result in one room there are sleeping a husband and wife a daughter aged 26 and two sons of 21 and 19. In Newcastle the Medical Officer of Health reported in 1922 that

there were 2 500 houses waiting to be condemned, at least half of which should be demolished. In one small room father and mother and five children were living entirely, and in another father and mother and ten children.

Apart from the gross overcrowding of the house, there are whole areas in our big towns where the houses are so crowded together as to prevent access of sufficient air and sunshine. Many districts exist where no fewer than 80 houses are crowded to the acre whereas the standard adopted for new housing schemes limits the number to be built to twelve. Added to these facts is the scandalously inadequate provision for sanitation and water supply in many of the slum areas, and the fact that in many cases houses which were originally intended for one family are inhabited by four or five with no adaptation. There is for example a court in Carlisle where some sixty families live, none of the houses having any internal sanitary arrangements but the whole of the population some 350 in number having to use six sanitary conveniences in the centre of the court, and to share six water taps. We get from this some idea of what housing conditions are in Christian England in the twentieth century.

Space does not permit of a detailed description of the bad effects of the lack of town planning in the past but even the most cursory observation of most of our industrial towns reveals to the observer the fact that factories and houses are jumbled up together without any ordered plan that the comfort and health of the working class population is seriously impaired by the proximity of smoky and noisy factories that the facilities for open air recreation are grossly inadequate, and that young men and girls who wish to play games on a Saturday have in many cases to travel three and four miles in order

to do so. The squalor and monotony of the streets and the lack of any kind of dignity or attempt to secure amenity, has a general depressing effect upon the population as a whole.

Not merely are the opportunities for open air recreation far too restricted, but extremely inadequate facilities are provided for indoor recreation. There are a certain number of boys' and girls' clubs, and there are the cinemas, but for a large proportion of the working men the public house is the only place of recreation in their immediate neighbourhood. Unfortunately, most of these houses are little more than shops where drink can be obtained. The "improved" public houses, where they exist, are for the most part situated in the more well-to-do districts.

It is unnecessary to elaborate the existing conditions, but the facts are beyond dispute. It is, however, necessary to consider briefly the effects of these environmental conditions upon physical and moral life, and to estimate the extent to which bad environment is a hindrance to the "way of the Spirit."

As to the physical effects, it is only necessary to quote the words of Dr. Childe in his presidential address at the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association in 1923:

'The breeding ground of this disease (tuberculosis) the environment most encouraging to its activities is the sunless airless overcrowded and insanitary slum areas of our great cities where houses are built forty or more to the acre and stand back to back and side by side like any jigsaw puzzle, so that fresh air and sunlight, the proved destructive agents of the tubercle bacillus can never enter. Is it a sound economic position to equip and maintain at the cost of millions of the taxpayers' money sanatoria for the so-called tuberculous, and by the exclusion of fresh air and sunlight, which cost nothing, maintain in our midst a soil which can

breed more tuberculosis in a week than all our sanatoria can cure in a year? In overcrowding, confinement, want of air and sunlight we have an environment conducive to the development of rickets, either by the supply of conditions favourable to the activities of the virus whether microbic or otherwise, or by lowering natural resistance to it. Conversely, fresh air and sunlight and good hygienic conditions, furnish an environment which is powerfully antagonistic to the disease, they may have the power of damping down the virus, whatever it is or they can so alter the metabolism of the body as to provide an increased resistance and immunity to it."

Apart, however, from the direct effects upon disease of bad environment, there is the general sapping of vitality caused by overcrowding and by monotonous and squalid surroundings. The fact that middle class parents use every effort to ensure that their children shall be reared in open surroundings and would be horrified at the prospect of having to rear them in Stepney or the Ancoats area of Manchester, should make us realize the extent of our crime in failing to use every endeavour to improve the environment of poor children.

But the moral and physical effects of bad housing are even more disastrous than the physical. It is, of course, possible, with God's help, for a family of six or eight to lead a noble Christian life herded together in a single room, but no one can deny that the difficulties in achieving this are a thousandfold greater than where the same family has a pleasing, self contained, five roomed house, which is well and conveniently planned and provided with sufficient air space surrounding it.

Take the case quoted already, where in one room a husband and wife, daughter of 26 and two sons aged 22 and 19 have to sleep. The Medical Officer of Health of Glasgow reports that more than half the population of that city live entirely as families in

one room or two-room tenements. It is not merely that such conditions increase the difficulties of sexual purity, but the fact that a number of people have to live together in a confined atmosphere, practically tumbling over each other, leads to irritation and quarrelling amongst even the best-tempered of people. Attention is constantly directed to the drink evil and the thronging of the public houses, but what is to be said of a community which condemns a working man to live in a single-roomed home with his wife and children, and when he comes back from work to have to spend his leisure hours under such conditions? Is it any wonder that the conditions of the public houses are what they are? What, again, is the use of spending large sums on education where the children have to prepare their home lessons amongst squalling babies?

We have, therefore, to face the following serious situation, namely, that the home environment of a large proportion of the population is such as to seriously militate against physical, moral and spiritual well-being. We have to ask ourselves what we propose to do about it.

Hundreds of thousands of our brothers and sisters are living in overcrowded slum houses. Their children have no place but the street in which to play. The atmosphere surrounding them is sordid and is polluted by the smoke of factories. As individuals and in our corporate capacity as a Church, we say that these things ought not to exist. Unfortunately, we are too often apt to explain that we are not responsible for those conditions coming into existence, and that the reason why the abuses are not swept away, and the conditions improved, is that some other group of people are failing to do their duty. According to our bias or prejudice, we blame the bricklayer for not laying more bricks, the greedy

landlord for refusing to sell land at a more reasonable price, or the manufacturer of materials for forming combines to raise prices. We speak with righteous indignation about owners of slum property.

There is an element of truth in all these suggestions, but it is not the whole truth or even the main truth. These conditions could be altered, and would have been altered long ago, if professing Christian people had been prepared to act in a Christian manner. We have first to cast out the beam in our own eye. The good Samaritan did not waste time in writing to *The Times* to complain that the highways were dangerous owing to the presence of thieves and robbers, and to suggest that the Government were to blame in not providing sufficient police. He did not stop to ask as to who was going to repay him for his trouble and for the money he was advancing to the man who had fallen among thieves. He got on with the job. We have to ask ourselves what can we do individually and corporately as a great Christian Church.

Now, there is no use in shutting our eyes to the fact that a solution of the housing problem cannot be found by building many hundreds of thousands of houses to be let at rents which are not strictly commercial. In other words, the houses will have to be subsidized either by the State or the Local Authority or both. The existing Acts of Parliament have recognized this fact. If we are to meet the needs of the poorer section of the community, the houses must be available for letting at weekly rents, and the rents must be within their reach.

Our first and foremost duty, therefore, is to be prepared to pay. The rich young ruler, when told to sell all that he had and give to the poor, went sorrowfully away. At any rate, he did not have-

the face to maintain in argument, as one of the new poor, that the burdens of income tax and rates prevented his contributing more than he was doing. If housing conditions are to be improved, we have all got to pay for our past neglect.

Our second task is to be prepared to act with courage and energy. The Housing Acts are on the Statute Book. If energetically administered by every Local Authority, a solution of the housing problem would be secured in a comparatively few years. Few Local Authorities, however, are doing all that they could. It is not for us to tell each other that it is the fault of the Local Authorities, but to realize that it is our fault. Borough Councillors are our representatives. If every possible step is not taken to speed up the building of houses, then it is for us to arouse public opinion to insist upon more energetic action.

We have got to make it clear to the country, that so far as the Church and Church people are concerned, they will not tolerate a continuance of the present abuses, that they are prepared to take their share in bearing the cost of altering them, and are not going to rest content with a slack administration merely in order to avoid offending certain individuals.

In order that such action may be effective, we must study the facts and if necessary give publicity to them, and also study the legislative powers and duties of Local Authorities so that we may be well-informed as to what can be done. In addition, we must set a high ideal of housing before ourselves and the public generally, and work for the production of houses which shall be real healthy and happy homes, and not mere brick boxes with slate lids. We must deal with the housing problem as a human problem, and not as a mere abstract problem of administration.

In addition, however, to all of these steps, there are considerable possibilities for individuals and groups of individuals to secure improvements in environment, and particularly the building of new houses. Those who are owners of working class house property can see that their own property is kept in good repair and improved so far as practicable. Public utility housing societies can be formed, and those who have a certain amount of capital can do much by being prepared to invest at moderate rates of interest in these societies and try to secure from the Local Authorities loans and subsidies to enable the societies to carry out successful schemes, and in this connection to continue knocking until the door is opened.

Those who own land can offer it either by way of gift or at a low price for housing purposes, those who are building contractors or manufacturers of building materials can take their part without trying to get undue profits, those who are building operatives can put their best work into the production of the houses themselves

Apart from the building of new houses, individuals can do much to improve the condition of those which now exist. Armed with a knowledge of the powers under the Acts, and with knowledge of the defects in the existing houses, they can report them to the Medical Officer of Health or Sanitary Inspector, and ask for them to be inspected. In many districts individual citizens have done a great deal to improve conditions by acting in this way

As explained before, however, the improvement of environment is not merely a question of housing. The Town Planning Acts must be administered energetically and with knowledge and foresight so as to prevent future extensions of our towns from being as haphazard as in the past. The Acts give

adequate powers to the authorities to control development in the future, to separate residential from industrial areas, to reserve adequate land for play grounds and for open spaces. The extent to which these powers are used largely depends upon the influence of public opinion and in the formation of this the Church has a big part and a big responsibility.

Finally, the problem of recreation must be considered *ad hoc*. If we are not satisfied with a state of affairs in which a large proportion of young men and women have no place to play outdoor games if we are dissatisfied with the places of indoor recreation, with the nature of the public house, then we must study ways and means to improve these conditions.

May I conclude by giving an example of a certain Protestant clergyman in a poor parish in Dublin. He had no money of his own. The people surrounding him were living in terribly overcrowded conditions. In one house originally designed for a single family, no fewer than 64 people were living. He decided to form a public utility society for housing and to start with the building of twelve houses. First of all he went to those who he thought had sufficient money to help him, and got little response. He went to those who had less money and got considerable response. He raised sufficient money to enable him with a loan from the Government to build the twelve houses. The demand was still tremendous. He went to the Dublin Corporation to try and get them to assist him with loans. Despite the fact of the old religious bitterness in Dublin, and despite the fact that the Corporation was predominantly Roman Catholic, he readily got assistance, and from conversations I have had in Dublin there is no doubt that it was because he had shown already

that he was a Christian in deed, and not merely in name, and was prepared to do the job that there are now well over 100 houses built by his society, and he is continuing his activities. On the initiative of a number of individuals sympathetic with his work, mostly Roman Catholics, a fund was collected to present him with a motor car because the people were afraid that the fact of his having to bicycle round trying to raise money for his scheme, added to his other work, would break down his health. At a recent meeting in the Mansion House at Dublin, at which I was speaking, two or three of the most prominent Roman Catholics in public affairs in Dublin got up to pay tribute to the wonderful work which he had accomplished. When one remembers what the feeling has been in the past between Roman Catholics and Protestants in Dublin, this is surely a wonderful tribute to a man without money who started in a poor district to endeavour to improve the environment. His achievements are the direct result of faith and prayer. What could not the many millions composing the Church of England achieve if they had similar faith and determination!

Contrast the results achieved, with God's help, by this one man with the action of the ratepayers in one of the rich wards in Kensington where they refused to vote for a Conservative candidate, duly adopted by his association, because he advocated housing reform, but deliberately selected another candidate of the same party, because they were afraid of a small increase in rates resulting from the improvement of the conditions of their poorer brethren. Yet there is no district where the churches are more thronged with people willing to sing "Were the whole realm of nature mine, that were an offering far too small", or to listen to our Lord's Command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

adequate powers to the authorities to control development in the future, to separate residential from industrial areas, to reserve adequate land for play grounds and for open spaces. The extent to which these powers are used largely depends upon the influence of public opinion, and in the formation of this the Church has a big part and a big responsibility.

Finally the problem of recreation must be considered *ad hoc*. If we are not satisfied with a state of affairs in which a large proportion of young men and women have no place to play outdoor games if we are dissatisfied with the places of indoor recreation with the nature of the public house, then we must study ways and means to improve these conditions.

May I conclude by giving an example of a certain Protestant clergyman in a poor parish in Dublin. He had no money of his own. The people surrounding him were living in terribly overcrowded conditions. In one house originally designed for a single family no fewer than 64 people were living. He decided to form a public utility society for housing and to start with the building of twelve houses. First of all he went to those who he thought had sufficient money to help him and got little response. He went to those who had less money and got considerable response. He raised sufficient money to enable him with a loan from the Government, to build the twelve houses. The demand was still tremendous. He went to the Dublin Corporation to try and get them to assist him with loans. Despite the fact of the old religious bitterness in Dublin and despite the fact that the Corporation was predominantly Roman Catholic he readily got assistance and from conversations I have had in Dublin there is no doubt that it was because he had shown already

that he was a Christian in deed, and not merely in name, and was prepared to do the job that there are now well over 100 houses built by his society, and he is continuing his activities. On the initiative of a number of individuals sympathetic with his work, mostly Roman Catholics, a fund was collected to present him with a motor-car because the people were afraid that the fact of his having to bicycle round trying to raise money for his scheme, added to his other work, would break down his health. At a recent meeting in the Mansion House at Dublin, at which I was speaking, two or three of the most prominent Roman Catholics in public affairs in Dublin got up to pay tribute to the wonderful work which he had accomplished. When one remembers what the feeling has been in the past between Roman Catholics and Protestants in Dublin, this is surely a wonderful tribute to a man without money who started in a poor district to endeavour to improve the environment. *His achievements are the direct result of faith and prayer.* What could not the many millions composing the Church of England achieve if they had similar faith and determination!

Contrast the results achieved, with God's help, by this one man with the action of the ratepayers in one of the rich wards in Kensington where they refused to vote for a Conservative candidate, duly adopted by his association, because he advocated housing reform, but deliberately selected another candidate of the same party, because they were afraid of a small increase in rates resulting from the improvement of the conditions of their poorer brethren. Yet there is no district where the churches are more thronged with people willing to sing "Were the whole realm of nature mine, that were an offering far too small"; or to listen to our Lord's Command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

PREPARING HIS WAY. (b) BY THE
EXPRESSION OF BEAUTY (*Art*)

(1) By Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D.,
*Professor of Ecclesiastical Art in King's College,
London.*

ART is expression, the expression of spiritual values. To realize this is to discard for ever the notion that art is the engendering of knickknacks, to discard even the more respectable notion that art means pictures; for painting is only one form of expression, and perhaps the most difficult of all to understand. Many people think they are inartistic because they do not care about pictures, which is as if a man should think himself illiterate because he cannot read Russian. The truth is that all men are artistic, because all men are human, but no one can adequately appreciate the more difficult forms of art without the necessary education—a man, for instance, whose vocabulary is limited to three or four hundred words cannot appreciate the poetry of Milton. Some again are gifted with one form of understanding, but are deficient in another. Shelley had no ear for music, he could not tell one tune from another, but he had an ear for poetry, a gift for the expression of sublimated thought which has rarely been equalled.

¶ All men are naturally artistic, because they are made in the image of God. But, again, some in recent generations have had their understanding perverted by bad education. You can easily defile the fresh mind of a child and pervert his natural intuitions. All, except the tone-deaf, have a natural liking for

good music, if it is simple, and all, except the colour blind, have a natural delight in clean colour (Do not all children love folk song and flowers?) But if you tell people that sacred music is doleful and sloppy, and that ecclesiastical colours range from a debilitating green to a devastating violet, one of two things will happen either you will deprave their understanding, or they will develop into bright young art students (and others) who hate the Church and all that they have been taught to think that religion means

Art is expression and it is universally understood. In some form or other, it appeals to everyone, and everyone needs it, as everyone loves it. In most of its forms (as in architecture, music, or sculpture) it is international because it needs no translation, and other nations judge us by our arts. Indeed, this is the final judgment of posterity: we judge the civilisations of the past by their art, we explore and excavate, we say 'This people was savage, that people was gross, but this, and this, were civilized.' And in estimating the civilization we discover also the value of the religion, for no great art has ever existed apart from religion and the chief work of art has always been the interpretation of religion, from the Dynasties of Egypt to Pheidias, from the domes and mosaics of Byzantine Christianity and the cathedrals of France and England to Giotto, Michelangelo, and Rembrandt, from Homer to Wordsworth, from the Golden Sequence to Bach and Beethoven.

And this method of expression which we call Art, although it is the highest and capable of subtleties so difficult that only the greatest geniuses can master them, is yet not only universally understood but also universally practised. For everyone is, or can be, a practising artist: he may not be a painter,

sculptor, cabinet-maker, metal worker, weaver, needle-worker, poet, or composer. But have you been in a school and heard the children sing as nowadays they are being taught to sing? Just think what artists we naturally are. Singing—nearly everyone can sing in unison: playing—a century ago (before the detestable harmonium was invented, and before even churches were blocked up with cheap organs) half the men in a small village could play a musical instrument. Dancing—everyone can dance; and if we were as Scriptural as we profess to be, we should naturally associate dancing with religion. Ceremonial, both secular and religious—everyone can take part, and what is so popular as a great out-door procession? Rhetoric and elocution—do not we parsons in our humble way, try to practise these two arts? And there are many other humble yet all important arts. Costume, for instance, which has so many effects on mind and body. The domestic arts—to make the home a work of art, and all that is therein, from the kitchen and dining-room to the parlour and bedrooms, refined and beautiful—these are a matter in which our women are far behind the women of France, and by insistence on these arts our elementary girls' schools can bring a new honour and a new happiness into millions of houses. And the art of good manners—the absence of which turns the Charity of St. Paul into an open sore, and brings hell into many homes and an atmosphere of hatred into many villages. And the drama—the real amateur universal drama, the huge significance of which we are only just beginning to grasp.

An abundance of arts! Arts in which you and I are both artists and audience. And one little universal art, the disinterested, charitable, divine, art of gardening. "God planted man in a garden,"

though we have often reduced him to a window-box

And all art is the expression of spiritual values. Consider. The art of good manners in the home and the street is the expression of love which is courteous, is kind. The art of dancing is the expression of joy. The art of architecture is the expression of peace perhaps more than of anything else. Love, joy, peace, and St. Paul says that these are the first three fruits of the Holy Spirit. We are coming near to the heart of our subject.

Let me try and put it into one sentence. All the light which comes from God into the heart and mind of man—all his spirit—is what we mean by the spiritual values, these can only be adequately expressed, and therefore properly understood, through art, because art is expression of a particular kind, it is expression in terms of beauty, and you can never give a true and lasting expression of spiritual values except in terms of beauty.

Why? Because God is not only Truth and Goodness, He is also Beauty, and the 'first author of all beauty.' Therefore if beauty is absent from your expression it will so far fall short of the Divine character. Take the expression of Goodness, for instance. it is not adequately expressed in the life of a virtuous, dull, upright man. it is only expressed with any approach to adequacy in the life of a saint. and then we say, not merely "What a righteous life!" or even "What a good life!" but we say—instinctively—"What a beautiful life!"—and only a few lives in the disappointing volumes of hagiography have this divine fragrance, a few, like St. Francis who was as M. Sabatier says "above all a poet and an artist," whose beautiful life passed into the imperishable beauty of Heaven seven hundred years ago.

Perhaps this will be better understood if we take

another instance When St. Paul sat down to describe the greatest truth in all his message, he burst into poetry, and that immortal poem on charity is familiar to all, is understood by all, just because it is a work of art and to that poem, more than anything else in the world, outside the four gospels, we owe the realization of Christianity as the religion of love If he had written that chapter in prose, no one would have understood, no one would have remembered, because he would not have really expressed the idea of love, which can only be expressed in terms of beauty Yes! he made a picture of it, for all to see

The highest example of all I would leave to your quiet reflection You will realize that our Lord taught goodness by the beauty of holiness, and truth in the form of poetry The Unique Son of the Supreme Artist was Himself an artist He speaks always as a poet, His teaching differs utterly from that of His followers from St. Paul to the last of the Fathers and latest of the theologians, in that He taught in pictures, in little romances, with balanced verses and bright images and summed up his message in that poet's phrase 'The Kingdom of Heaven' He did not teach scientifically, by logic and dogma, but æsthetically by act a picture, a poetic fable

That is surely the supreme instance of His wisdom People sometimes wonder why He made no code or system, why He avoided creeds and dogmas and articles of religion. The reason may be twofold

1 Scientific expression is necessarily provisional it has to be made out in the categories of the day Invaluable as it is it cannot be permanent, but must develop if it is true and die if it is not. If even Jesus Christ Himself had expressed His Gospel in scientific formulas and had made His revelation into dogma, it would have grown obsolete. But

æsthetic expression does not wax stale, because its content is unlimited. Of all the best art it may be said, as of a certain Greek vase.—

“ Ah happy, happy boughs ! That cannot show
Your leaves, nor ever bid the spring adieu ,
And happy melodist, unwearied,
For ever piping songs for ever new ”

And this is as true of the sayings of our Lord as of the Elgin Marbles. They have the freshness and the fragrance of spring flowers.

2. Æsthetic expression alone can give a true idea of spiritual values. Scientific or dogmatic expression can merely supply pointers to show the direction, or a framework to establish a system by the comparison of observed facts—an all important work. But science cannot express the spiritual values, and that is why in ages of rampant dogmatism, like the fourth or the seventeenth centuries, the work of the Holy Spirit was forgotten—few people in the seventeenth century were interested in the Holy Ghost, except the Quakers who rebelled against the letter in all its forms. Similarly, our nineteenth century hymn books contained hardly anything about the Holy Spirit, and indeed very little about God the Father. The spiritual values can only be expressed in terms of beauty—by art, such as poetry, which transmutes the latter into the spirit, or by music, which soars into the realm where language is dumb.

It is of the utmost importance that we should reason about life and religion, and should express our thought in terms as scientific as possible. But most of our theological mistakes are due to the illusion that these statements are adequate, are the truth. Of course they are not. They may be true as far as they go, but in the nature of things

they must be inadequate, they cannot convey the whole truth

The ghastly ideas with which the fact of atonement has been defiled are due to this mistake. No formulas can express the truth of atonement—not even the great words “I believe in God the Father”, but Jesus expressed it once for all in the poem about the Prodigal Son. The Holy Spirit cannot be grasped by human phraseology, only now and then by the flash of His beauty can we begin to understand. For this reason the poets and other artists are the kings of mankind, they can sometimes see the values of the Spirit, and understand, and transmit them to us in forms that never wax old and never mislead, because they are adequate to their task of being the sacraments of the unseen.

Art is the secret of the Church as it is the secret of all noble forms of human fellowship. This is the reason for the strange fact that the credit of the Church to day stands, not on the theological systems of the past, but on its architecture, its ceremonial, its music, crafts, sculpture and painting. Histories of the most terrifyingly true description can be compiled by men like Monsieur Houtin about the theologies and customs, and about the forgeries and persecutions of the past, but the Church can still point to her cathedrals and say, “At least, we made these. Here we expressed our faith aright.” And it is true, all that was good amid the evils of the past, all that was true amidst its terrors, is expressed in its art, from the beauty of its earliest frescoes to that of the good men and women who live out the poetry of their fragrant lives among us to day. And may I add that I think the historians of the future will say —“The decline of religion in the nineteenth century is shown by the fact that all the good art of that period was outside the Churches. The first

insisting upon any one formula, or calling upon the races of the world to submit to any collection of phrases however admirable. But how can religion be expressed? Only as our Master has expressed it, in terms of beauty—in that light of the Spirit which as the Gospels prove to-day, express the eternal truth in images as unfading as truth itself, in that beauty of God which even the dense can understand, even the cold can love, even the sinner admit and admire.

Beauty is my subject in this paper, and not truth—art and not science. But I wish to make it very clear that the Holy Spirit is truth as well as beauty, the inspirer of the scientist as well as the artist. The whole secret of life is in the realization that the manifestation of God is not one but three, that religion is not the pursuit of righteousness alone, but of beauty and truth also, and that indeed perfect goodness—the goodness manifested in our Lord—is also truth and beauty. He was full of grace and truth—of *λαρις* that subtle Greek word for beauty, and of truth. He is the Beautiful Shepherd—*ο ποιμην ο καλος*.

We need so urgently to-day the highest intellectual integrity, interpreting religion in the light of all that philosophy, history, scholarship, natural science, psychology, can bring, that an effort is required to remember the other side. In a word, that other side is simply this that our philosophy will be false if it is without a true æsthetic, and our scientific labour will miss the truth if it is divorced from art. The work of science is to compare, the business of axioms, theories, doctrines, principles, is to preserve, develop, explain. The goal of philosophy is the bringing of "all thought and objects of all thought," all science and art, into unity. The realization of this goal is religion. Scholarship and criticism are necessary to religion, in order to remove the falsehoods by which

popular superstition and clerical professionalism have obscured the truth, but the truth will be lost again unless it is salted with beauty

And without beauty there is no truth, for truth cannot be partial Without beauty there can be no true religion, since to worship a being without beauty is not to worship the true God who makes the flowers and the hills, just as to worship the god of hell fire is not to worship a good God And a god without beauty is a false god, just as a god without goodness is a false god And to worship a false god does a man harm and not good

Beauty therefore is necessary to true religion, and true religion cannot be adequately expressed except in terms of beauty and of truth Without art, religion will not be expressed, explained, or understood, nor will it be realized by those who profess it And this is true of the simplest Bible Christian, since the books which he loves would long since have been forgotten had they not been great works of art, and they owe their dynamic vitality to day to the fact that they are full of that form of inspiration which we call poetry

But art is not only expression it is also a form of worship When people say that our churches are for worship and that therefore we must not turn our churches into concert rooms or our services into a masquerade they are perfectly right, but their reasons are wrong For the true reason is artistic to turn a church into a concert room is simply bad art, to turn our services into a fussy, creepy crawly masquerade is simply bad art, and neither method is the expression of true religion, any more than the dismal, doleful method is the expression of true religion Music whether trivial or crawling garments whether sable or garish ceremonial whether static, busting or convulsive, are so far wrong because they

are bad art, and therefore not true worship. In these casual epithets I have suggested much of our present-day way of worship. But it has got to stop, or public worship and organized religion itself will disappear.

We have first to get our philosophy right, to realize the Spirit of God manifested in beauty, to make everyone understand not only that the worship of the true God requires art as a plant requires water, but more—that true worship is not a mere alliance with art, but is art, that there can be no public worship without art—many forms of art, and that, just as all great art has always been the expression of religion, so true worship must always express

Such services will indeed attract. People will flock to them. But that will be because we have not tried to make them attractive. They will draw men in the end simply because we have tried to carry out the will of God. And at first the attempt to carry out His will may not be always successful, for the right minded who would naturally help us have often been long driven away from the church, and in some places only an obdurate rump remains. But if we do right because it is right, if we follow the Holy Spirit for its own sake, and seek His beauty because it is divine, then the Church of Christ will succeed in a way that will make all past ages pale beside the age which is to come.

It will not be easy at first. A hundred years ago it would have been almost easy, because our churches were then unspoilt compared with what they are to-day. We have to struggle, many of us, amid architecture which expresses nothing but a sham romance and a sham antiquity, and all of us against stained glass which (unlike anything before produced by the hand of man) offends equally against beauty and against truth. And in all the things we have to do there is a bad tradition, an atmosphere that is mawkish, dreary, and unmeaning. Our work is difficult, because we have great arrears to make up. But Liverpool Cathedral is here to show us what can be done, with vision and with courage (for beauty cannot be found without the moral virtues also). Mistakes and disappointments there will be, but goodness will help us—humility and courage. The worst part will be the first until the jungle is cleared. I am sure that it will all be done. But my fear is this—that it may take fifty years and I do not think that our fellow countrymen will give us fifty years.

Religion is reconciled to science at least among educated people. The problem of the next twenty

years is Will it be reconciled to art, in time? The Christian Social Movement has given England the thought of God as the Spirit of goodness, science has given the thought of God as the Spirit of Truth. Shall we now allow art to give the thought of God as the Spirit of Beauty?

That is our present question of life and death. It is in the sphere of beauty that the recovery of vitality will take place. In that sphere we shall discard our prejudices and forget our debasing party cries, and we shall find truth, and by the means of beauty we shall express truth and make the glory of God visible to all men. In that light of the Spirit we shall see things as they are and by that light we shall show them to others. Then indeed religion will attract, as the loadstone draws the iron, then indeed men will find their most thrilling and exalted moments in church, the fulfilment of their highest desires, the answer to all their questions, the opening of their eyes to the splendour of the vision of God, the radiance of an unearthly brightness. For in a Church where truth and truth only is proclaimed, where goodness is the common way of life, and where beauty never fails, they will find the King is His glory

PREPARING HIS WAY (b) BY THE
EXPRESSION OF BEAUTY (*Music*)

(ii) By SIR W H HADOW, C B E , D Mus ,
Vice Chancellor of Sheffield University

WE may find some difficulty in realizing that a generation, so near to the present day that many of its members are still active, should ever have taken seriously Matthew Arnold's definition of religion as "morality touched with emotion" It labours, indeed, under two fatal defects First that morality can be touched by many different kinds of emotion by that which accompanies the sentiment of *noblesse oblige*, or of personal affection, or even of Shaftesbury's æsthetic pleasure and that to describe all these as religious is clearly untenable The morality, in short, which the definition implies must be touched by one specific kind of emotion and if we ask "What kind?" the only answer that can be given is 'Religious' A more fundamental fault is that it makes morality the substance of religion and emotion a qualifying characteristic or attribute This it may be contended is a reversal of all natural order and proportion Religion is not a kind of morality, it is a higher synthesis in which morality itself is taken up and absorbed as the Idea of Good in Plato's *Republic* is the source not only of reality in the objective world but of true apprehension in the subjective Nor indeed need we go so far back as Plato for our allegory Christian at the outset of his Progress turned aside by ill advice to seek in the town of Morality a relief from his burden, and the imminent disaster which ensued came near bringing his whole pilgrimage to an end

Arnold's definition is in many ways characteristic of his time. It was a period of rather quiet and tepid reaction from the fervour of the Oxford Movement. His own genius inclined to restraint, equanimity, the golden mean, and these, however useful they may be as guides for conduct, are not really relevant as criteria of religion. At the present time there has come, together with much liberty of criticism (partly, perhaps, because of this), a new outpouring of the essential spirit of worship, the fulfilment of the Divine element in man by a more direct contact with its Divine source. At every period in religious history this has manifested itself to a greater or less degree, sometimes flowing in full measure, sometimes checked or distracted in what Bacon calls the *crems et vastitates temporum*, but never entirely without witness. And as an example and sign of its influence at the present day I would ask your attention to the great and widespread welcome which has been accorded to Dr. Rudolph Otto's book, *The Idea of the Holy*. With only one aspect of that book have I to deal here and that rather by way of a confirming illustration than of the analysis of an essential argument. The sympathy with which the book has everywhere been received is, I think, a clear indication that it not only expresses but focuses a truth of religion which we all recognize as valid.

According to Dr. Otto the central fact of religious experience is our apprehension of what he calls the "numinous", that is the inherent Divinity Whom we may clothe with all the noblest attributes that human imagination can devise, but to Whom the sum total of all these attributes is at best and highest only the garment that we see Him by. Cudworth in a fine metaphor once figured the Divine nature as *an infinite circle of which the centre was goodness*,

"the rays and expanding plat thereof" wisdom, and the circumference power Dr Otto goes further than this Even the goodness of God in any sense in which we can understand goodness is but an attribute of an essential nature which is behind and beyond it, the nature which corresponds to the "Ineffable" of the Greek mysteries, and which we can know, not in its own substance, but only in its effect on ourselves¹ This effect Dr Otto describes as the *tremendum mysterium*, that sense of overwhelmingness with its correlative self abasement which he illustrates from Abraham's plea with the Almighty (*Genesis* xviii 27), and might equally have illustrated from many passages in Isaiah If I might venture here to criticize him for a moment, I would suggest that he includes in this conception too personal an element of what he calls 'dread' an instinct of fear or distress which is, I think, not part of true religious emotion, but an alloy with which it is some times mixed The difference between religion and superstition has always seemed to me that in the last assay religion is love without fear, and superstition fear without love And if this be so, then our conception of the numinous is pure in proportion as it has freed itself from all elements of personal or self centred misgiving I would instance the climax in Newman's *Dream of Gerontius* as an example of what I mean For dread therefore, I would always substitute "awe," which, indeed, Dr Otto also emphasizes, that awe which, partly schematized, we feel in the presence of great genius, but which burns with purest flame in the act of Divine Worship the sense that we are in the presence of something different in kind from our common human experience, but at the same time something the contemplation of

¹ Suso calls it The height of the Divine Majesty, transcending substance See Otto op cit, p 109

which arouses us, not so much to the sense of our own shortcomings as to the love of its supreme power and goodness.

If this be so, it means that the act of worship carries us up through the empirical world, through even the scientific world of laws or the Platonic world of ideas, and brings us as near as human nature can be brought to the very centre and source of all things. And this makes it especially right and fitting that in the act of worship music should bear an essential part, that it should be one of the ways through which the mystical contact of the soul with God is embodied and expressed. I am in no way depreciating or decrying other forms of beauty in our liturgical use—on the contrary, I would have every avenue—sense, emotion and reason—exalted and ennobled by the skill of architect and painter and cunning workman, by all the beauty and majesty of words by the dignity of befitting pageant and ceremonial by every means which can attune the mind of the hearer and purify his soul for the Divine message. But apart from any question of comparison, which it is not, perhaps, necessary here to raise I would plead that music has a positive and essential place in our worship and that this entails as necessary correlative great care in its selection and a great sense of responsibility in its use.

We may accept without cavil the view of the anthropologists that music originates from the heightened expression of feeling—at first, perhaps only interjectional then growing more systematized as the feeling itself grows more articulate until it develops little by little into something that may definitely be described as song. Near the beginning of its history it was probably reinforced by that sheer delight in rhythmic movement which belongs to the childhood of the race as it does to the childhood of

the individual, not yet so much for the purpose of co-ordinated effort, though this comes not long after, but rather as a natural ebullient expression of life and movement, hence comes gesture, and, in very early stages of civilization, the dance. Again, if both these elements in music owe their origin to heightened emotion or to overflowing vitality, we should naturally expect that in any primitive religion where emotion is at its highest and vitality at its most intense, music should at once become the natural medium of worship, and this is abundantly corroborated by history. There is good evidence for holding that the dance was religious in origin. It appears in the Choric Hymns of the Greeks, it is even present in the Old Testament, and traces of its use may be found in the annals of the Christian Church. But far more important than this is the use of music as the natural vehicle of liturgical worship not as some appanage added to the words by afterthought in order to give them further colour or beauty, but as the very soul and inspiration of the religious feeling which the words themselves can but partly and imperfectly embody. An interesting passage on this subject may be found in Sir James Frazer's book on *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (pp 46-7) which runs as follows

In our own day a great religious writer himself deeply sensitive to the witchery of music has said that musical notes with all their power to fire the blood and melt the heart cannot be mere empty sounds and nothing more, no they have escaped from some higher sphere they are outpourings of eternal harmony the voice of angels the Magnificat of saints. It is thus that the rude imaginings of primitive man are transfigured and his feeble lisps echoed with a rolling reverberation in the musical prose of Newman. Indeed the influence of music on the development of religion is a subject which would repay a sympathetic study. For we cannot doubt that this the most intimate and affecting of all the arts has done much to create as well as to express the

religious emotions, thus modifying more or less deeply the fabric of belief to which at first sight it seems only to minister. The musician has done his part as well as the prophet and the thinker in the making of religion. Every faith has its appropriate music, and the difference between the creeds might almost be expressed in musical notation. The interval, for example, which divides the wild revels of Cybele from the stately ritual of the Catholic Church is measured by the gulf which severs the dissonant clash of cymbals and tambourines from the grave harmonies of Palestrina and Handel. A different spirit breathes in the difference of the music."¹

It will be observed that Sir James Frazer, who holds no brief for religious music, assigns to it a naturally creative influence in the progress of religious worship; a far more important place than that of a mere accessory or accompaniment to an act of worship which could as well have proceeded without it. And I believe that music can accomplish this because, more intimately than any articulate speech, it can represent and express the numinous in human utterance. This claim may possibly be met at first with some challenge, even with some incredulity. That is because many of our people have still so little musical training that the art speaks to them in tones as remote and unintelligible as those of an unknown language. A man is still liable to be accused of paradox if he maintains that music is inherently significant, that its meaning is not less but more intense than that of articulate speech, that it penetrates still further into essential truth, that it rises still higher towards essential goodness, that the beauty which, in some measure, all will agree to assign to it is not, as many people seem to think, a matter of sensuous gratification in which the higher elements of human nature have no place, but the very crown and climax of human nature, the nearest

¹ J. H. Newman, *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*, No. xv, pp. 346 sq.

that it ever attains to the expression of the Divine

And yet this is the place that has been accorded to it by almost all philosophic writers who have treated it with understanding. We know what importance Plato assigned, in *The Republic*, to the right ordering of musical speech, in *The Laws* he is still more detailed and still more emphatic. Aristotle's testimony, though perhaps fragmentary and imperfect, speaks with almost equal conviction. The place of music in mediæval education was largely determined by its acknowledged importance in the services of the Church. Most clear of all is the witness of Schopenhauer who, in the third book of *The World as Will and Idea*, assigns to music the highest place among all forms of human expression. The argument has been often quoted—it is familiar to most readers—and it may here be summarized for purposes of reference. The lowest form of human apprehension, says Schopenhauer, is that which regards only individual things and those only in relation to our own will, i.e. the use that we can make of them. We may imagine this kind of apprehension to be shared by the rest of animal creation, it appears in man through the ordinary experience of everyday life where the phenomena by which we are surrounded are but so many instruments and tools for effecting our immediate purpose. Next above this comes the scientific apprehension in Bacon's sense of this term, i.e. the inductive power which correlates phenomena and sees them as instances of natural law. Higher still is the imagination of the poet culminating in tragic drama, which Schopenhauer regards as the supreme form of poetry, and dealing not with individual phenomena at all, not with photographic reproductions of particular people or particular scenes, but with the *idea*, of which individual phenomena are the transitory and imperfect embodiments. Hence, the test of great

religious emotions thus modifying more or less deeply the fabric of belief to which at first sight it seems only to minister. The musician has done his part as well as the prophet and the thinker in the making of religion. Every faith has its appropriate music, and the difference between the creeds might almost be expressed in musical notation. The interval, for example, which divides the wild revels of Cybele from the stately ritual of the Catholic Church is measured by the gulf which severs the dissonant clash of cymbals and tambourines from the grave harmonies of Palestrina and Handel. A different spirit breathes in the difference of the music.¹

It will be observed that Sir James Frazer, who holds no brief for religious music, assigns to it a naturally creative influence in the progress of religious worship, a far more important place than that of a mere accessory or accompaniment to an act of worship which could as well have proceeded without it. And I believe that music can accomplish this because, more intimately than any articulate speech it can represent and express the numinous in human utterance. This claim may possibly be met at first with some challenge, even with some incredulity. That is because many of our people have still so little musical training that the art speaks to them in tones as remote and unintelligible as those of an unknown language. A man is still liable to be accused of paradox if he maintains that music is inherently significant, that its meaning is not less but more intense than that of articulate speech, that it penetrates still further into essential truth, that it rises still higher towards essential goodness, that the beauty which, in some measure, all will agree to assign to it is not, as many people seem to think, a matter of sensuous gratification in which the higher elements of human nature have no place but the very crown and climax of human nature, the nearest

that it ever attains to the expression of the Divine.

And yet this is the place that has been accorded to it by almost all philosophic writers who have treated it with understanding. We know what importance Plato assigned, in *The Republic*, to the right ordering of musical speech; in *The Laws* he is still more detailed and still more emphatic. Aristotle's testimony, though perhaps fragmentary and imperfect, speaks with almost equal conviction. The place of music in mediæval education was largely determined by its acknowledged importance in the services of the Church. Most clear of all is the witness of Schopenhauer who, in the third book of *The World as Will and Idea*, assigns to music the highest place among all forms of human expression. The argument has been often quoted—it is familiar to most readers—and it may here be summarized for purposes of reference. The lowest form of human apprehension, says Schopenhauer, is that which regards only individual things and those only in relation to our own will, i e. the use that we can make of them. We may imagine this kind of apprehension to be shared by the rest of animal creation, it appears in man through the ordinary experience of everyday life where the phenomena by which we are surrounded are but so many instruments and tools for effecting our immediate purpose. Next above this comes the scientific apprehension in Bacon's sense of this term, i e., the inductive power which correlates phenomena and sees them as instances of natural law. Higher still is the imagination of the poet culminating in tragic drama, which Schopenhauer regards as the supreme form of poetry, and dealing not with individual phenomena at all, not with photographic reproductions of particular people or particular scenes, but with the *essence* of which individual phenomena are the transitory and imperfect embodiments. Hence, the test of great

Solomon's Temple (*II Chron* v 12), which seems to have been on a more magnificent scale than any musical festival of our own time, the prophets are full of allusions to music—harvest songs, vintage songs and the like—some of the melodies of which were apparently incorporated for liturgical use, above all we have in the superscriptions of the Psalms a volume of musical information which, though not yet entirely and finally deciphered is, even in our limited understanding of it, conclusive. Some of these superscriptions relate to the kind of accompaniment—a single string instrument in one case in others a small band of strings or pipes, in others (this is probably the interpretation of 'maschil') a rich and elaborate accompaniment for a full orchestra. Other superscriptions deal with methods of performance, e.g., in the manner of Jeduthun¹ (*Psalms* lxxii). But most significant of all are those which specify the melody, sometimes of a folksong to which the Psalm is to be sung e.g. to Lilies, or to The Lily of Testimony," A Silent dove afar off " "Destroy not " (which is said to be a vintage song) and The Hind of the Morning. It is clear that where directions are so precise and so varied there must have been a care both for composition and for performance, which implies deep reverence for liturgical music. The orchestras were of string instruments (lyres and harps) wind instruments (trumpets and various kinds of pipe) and percussion instruments, including cymbals—one of which seems to have been used by the conductor for keeping time. As a rule the number seems to have been about 18 or

¹ The exact meaning is under dispute. Jeduthun was the eponymous founder of one of the three guilds of Temple singers (see *I Chron* xvi. 41-42 xxv 1 6 *II Chron* v 12 *Achem ah* xi 17) and it may refer to some method taught by him. Or it may mean some favourite instrument or melody. See Hastings Dictionary S V.

20—about the number which constituted Prince Esterhazy's "Capelle" when Haydn was his music master. On special occasions they were very largely increased, we are told that at the dedication of the Temple there were no less than 120 trumpeters. It may be taken as certain that the Hebrews had no knowledge of harmony, that the wind doubled the singers in unison, and that the strings were used for marking rhythmic figures. As to the nature of their music we have very little information, but the fact that they could regard melody as detachable from the words for which it was originally written is very significant, and the early example quoted by Rabbi Cohen in the pamphlet which he contributed to the Anglo Israelite Exhibition is of totally different character from anything else in ancient music—the earliest known stanza which we at the present day could recognize as melodic. Into this inheritance Christianity entered. On the night of Gethsemane our Lord Himself sang a hymn with His disciples said by tradition to have been the great Hallel, which consisted of Psalms 113-118, St Paul expressly enjoins the use of "Psalms and Hymns and spiritual songs" (*Ephesians* v 19, *Colossians* iii 16), and very probably quotes early examples of Christian Hymnody, e.g., the passage beginning "Awake, thou that sleepest" (*Eph* v 14), and possibly the passages recorded in *I Timothy* iii 16 and *I Timothy* vi 15-16. It is hardly necessary to add the many references to singing which occur in the Apocalypse and which evidently refer to it as an established practice. Pliny (*Epp* 96 and 97) reports to Trajan that the Christians of the early second century were singers of hymns. At some later time, which cannot be precisely determined, there flowed into this stream an important tributary from Greece. About Greek music as a matter of practice we know very little the theorists who survive

are too much concerned with grammatical niceties to be of much use, the philosophers deal mainly with its ethical and educational influence, but it is at any rate certain that the Christian Church took over from Greek usage the different Citharædic modes, with, perhaps, the names of their constituent notes and tetrachords, and very likely some of that practice of subtle and exact declamation in which the essence of Greek music seems to have consisted. At any rate whether from Greece or from Palestine, the tide of Christian music flowed from the East. The first hymn writer of whom we have any clear knowledge was Ephraem the Syrian, who greatly influenced the music of Eastern Europe. Two Church Councils those of Laodicea and Chalcedon both gave attention to church music, indeed, the Council of Laodicea issued a most salutary prohibition against the employment of compositions by unqualified amateurs. The earliest liturgies were of eastern origin. St Ambrose the most eminent of the early western hymn writers established at Milan the practice of antiphonal singing *secundum morem orientalium partium*. But if the East were leaders in this matter they were soon overtaken and even surpassed by the hymn writers of the West and by the progressive regulation of the service under Popes Damasus, Gelasius and perhaps Gregory I. The place of the last among these has been somewhat obscured by the extravagant and untenable claims put forth on his behalf but even if we cannot assign to him any specific addition or invention there can be no doubt that it was by his authority and influence that the Roman use gradually superseded those of other contemporary Churches. We in England have special reason to be grateful to him since the first seeds of our church music were sown at his instigation by Augustine and Paulinus who were followed in this matter by Wilfrid and Theodore of

Tarsus, the first great musical educators of this country, and so through Aldhelm and Dunstan to the assured harvest of the early middle ages. So far as we can tell the practice of polyphonal singing, which entirely revolutionized music, had its origin in the church service of our country, it may go back as far as Dunstan, it was certainly known in the twelfth century and prevalent in the thirteenth, and although it led to abuses, and especially that obscuring of the sacred text which led Erasmus to censure it as a violation of St Paul's rule against speaking in an unknown tongue, yet the splendour and beauty of sound which it received in such hands as that of the Netherlander Roland De Lattre, the Italian Palestrina, and the Englishmen Byrd and Tallis have apparelled it in such celestial light as musical art had never known before. We are very near the presence of the numinous when we hear the 'Missa Papae Marcelli' or the Penitential Psalms of De Lattre, or Byrd's "Justorum Animæ" and "Civitas Sancti Tui."

It is no part of our purpose to follow the course of ecclesiastical music through all the centuries, the ground which it covered is very wide and details have been abundantly discussed elsewhere. It is a matter of common knowledge that in the seventeenth century there followed on the great period of pure polyphony a tendency towards secularization and dramatic expression affected almost equally by the forms of opera and oratorio, which first blossomed during its earlier years. The tide of lightness and frivolity in music was stemmed during the earlier years of the eighteenth century by Bach and Handel, during the later by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. Yet even the Masses of Haydn and Mozart have been brought under ecclesiastical censure. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries we have been witnessing a

curious development of idiom in music very rapidly changing during its later years and leaving our composers of to day with a language almost as different from that of their predecessors as a Romance tongue from Latin. Mention however should specially be made of an unduly neglected chapter in ecclesiastic music—that provided by the composers of Spain and especially the writing of what was called the Valencian School. These are works of astonishing purity and dignity, almost entirely untouched by the course of secular events and maintaining even in the nineteenth century a sort of serene austerity so well proportioned that it could dispense with ornament, so solidly built that it offered no crevice for decay, a monument which we seem to have disregarded for no better reason than that it stands beyond the Pyrenees.

But it may be worth while briefly to trace the course of the history in our own country since church music was our chief means of expression when our musicians we stood in the forefront of Europe. Even when we forgot our traditions and forfeited our inheritance, there was always a little thread of Anthem or Canticle to prevent the record from being entirely broken. Ousted successively from every other form of composition English music at its darkest period could take sanctuary in the Church.

In the fifteenth century John Dunstable was by all acknowledgment the first composer in Europe. He seems to have lived much abroad and among his immediate pupils and successors the greatest were the founders of the Flemish School—Dufay Binchois and others. At the same time we have perhaps a little too easily accepted the sardonic criticism of Johannes Tinctor the Fleming that the English followers of Dunstable were mere imitators and that the Flemings alone carried on his work with original vitality and

intelligence. The re discovery of the Old Hall MS containing the compositions of King Henry VI and his contemporaries, has gone some way to modify this judgment, indeed, Henry VI has some claim for the highest place among royal composers. It is noticeable, by the way, through what a long period English music was aided by royal protection. Henry V sent for his Choir to Rouen, Henry VI composed motets for the service at Windsor, Richard III, whose true character Sir Clements Markham has apparently revealed to us, reorganized and endowed the Chapel Royal, Henry VIII was a celebrated musician, and so were at least two of his children. It was not until the time of James I that the royal favour was partially withdrawn, and even so it came back in full measure after the Restoration. Nor should we forget that it was George I who brought Handel to England, and that George III held him in very high honour and esteem.

At any rate, if Tinctor's reproach was ever justified, the occasion of it passed at the beginning of the sixteenth century. With Taverner and Shepherd, Tye and White, Tallis and Byrd and Orlando Gibbons, England produced a century of ecclesiastical music which is still one of the chief glories of our annals. At the death of Gibbons in 1625 began a period of decadence, stayed for a time by the genius of Purcell, but Purcell died when he was 37, and from his time to the middle of the nineteenth century England produced no composer to whom the word genius could rightly be applied. Before his influence could establish a School, Handel came over and at his approach our native music made way. Some historians claim Handel as our own, and no doubt this country made him welcome and he lived among us for over forty years, but we can no more claim Handel than the French can claim Lully. We were the land of his

choice and adoption, ours was not the pit from which he was digged. However, during this dark period we still kept a slender light burning before the altar. Greene, Handel's contemporary, had genuine talent and at least one of his anthems rises to a high level of stateliness and dignity. Battishill wrote a few fine things and would have written more had he not been broken hearted by a bereavement. The elder Wesley to whom chiefly we owe the study of Bach in England, produced in his fitful and eccentric life at least two masterpieces, Attwood carried on the tradition of Mozart, and Walmsley that of Attwood, Sebastian Wesley, unhappily influenced at times by the fashion for Spohr, had a really original gift and a limpid stream of pure and expressive melody. With his death in 1876 it may be said that the old order passed away and the renaissance of British music began with the almost simultaneous arrival of Parry and Stanford. Since then the line has been continued by Elgar and Vaughan Williams and Holst, who are now exchanging the ranks of the *Hastati* for those of the *Principes*. Among the younger men the attractions of church music are for the moment less potent than those of some other forms, but there are some whom we still expect to come to us with gifts in their hands.

It will be observed that in this brief historical sketch mention has occasionally been made of errors or frivolities by which the natural course of the church music has been either misled or demoralized. It may, perhaps be asked how this is compatible with the statement that music represents the numinous in human speech and that it is therefore correlative with the numinous in worship. The answer to this may be found in the Preface on the service of the Church which stands at the beginning of our Book of Common Prayer. There was never anything by the wit of man so well devised or so sure established which in continuance of time

hath not been corrupted " Music is no more immune from corruption than any other form of expression, even religion itself, which has to pass through the channels of an imperfect humanity. Indeed, we may say that music is in the greater danger because of the extraordinary apathy and carelessness with which most people regard it. I believe that when their attention is engaged all persons prefer good music to bad, noble to ignoble, but there is I think, no corner in the field of human civilization in which weeds have been allowed to grow with so little supervision. The result is that some error creeps in almost unperceived, it gains ground because no one cares to eradicate it, and by the time its intrusion is noticed it has taken such a flourishing root that, like a mandrake, it cannot be pulled up without tears. One instance of this is the abuse of mediæval polyphony which we have already noticed parts interwoven until the phrase was no longer intelligible, syllables protracted until the word was no longer articulate, secular melodies used as the staple of liturgical song. Another was the tendency to theatricalism which manifested itself among the lesser composers in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and which sprang from a desire to make the details of music expressive without a compensating grasp of its general structure. Another, specially prevalent some half century ago, was the tendency to softness and sentimentalism, which meant really the use of cheap and shallow formulae which even if they had done some little service in better hands, were quite inadequate for the purpose for which they were intended. Others, again sprang from mere ignorance and want of skill, the admission into the church service of work which, even if sincere in its intention was too clumsy and illiterate to deserve a place, and which I am afraid was very often a mere outburst of that small personal vanity which so very

frequently goes with incompetence. The prohibition of the Council of Laodicea ought to be repeated and extended in each generation.

There is here no need for apportioning any blame or censure. It is natural that men in the first flush of a new technique or a new medium should so misinterpret their functions as to make ingenuity an end in itself. It is not less natural that new forms or idioms of expression should, at the moment when they appear, attract an undue amount of attention by their very novelty, it requires a certain period of sifting before their places can be determined. Even the weaklings and the sentimentalists may in their shallow measure be endeavouring to say something which they have genuinely at heart. As a rule, church music, even at its least worthy, has been free from that commercialism which is the chief enemy of art and literature. But when all this has been granted to the full we should still be left with an unflinching resolve not to admit to our church services any kind or example of music which falls short of the highest standard that it can attain.

And this for two plain reasons. First that when we call our act of worship the Service, we are dedicating it as an offering to God, and before His Altar we have no right to present anything that is blemished. And secondly our act of worship brings into the Divine Presence the soul of the worshipper, which must, therefore, be purified and uplifted to the utmost of its spiritual capacity in order that it may gain the strengthening and refreshing which no unworthy recipient has a right to ask. And if it be argued that the recipient must in all cases be unworthy, and that, therefore, any such attempt is foredoomed to failure, the answer is that this is a counsel of despair which would equally justify the abrogation of all standards in every other part of the act of

worship But, indeed, as a matter of principle we can hardly doubt that there is here a general agreement It is needless to labour the point that when we attend the Supper of the Great King we must wear our wedding garment

This conclusion translated into practice means the application of a critical standard and the rigorous exclusion of all that falls below it There follows the inevitable question how and by whom this standard is to be applied, and at what point our line is to be drawn On this point I would venture to speak with entire frankness The standard should be applied by a council of those best fitted to speak in the name of church music, whether from the side of the Ministry or from the side of musical art or from those, of whom we have not a few in England, who can hold an authoritative balance between them, and the one general instruction under which such a council should act should be, "When in doubt exclude" Nothing, in short, should be admitted to the canon of church music which is not accepted as deserving of its place by a consensus of the liberal and trained judgment of those best fitted to pronounce A corpus of such music could easily be prepared, some of the work has already been done in various parts of the field, it could, of course, be left open so that further additions might be made from time to time as opportunity arose It would represent a monument of beauty and dignity and reverence as great in its way as the windows of York or the fabric of Westminster

Here some objections should be considered First that the exclusion of some of the works that have won their way into popular favour would give offence and would be met by resentment and alienation I do not believe that this objection is of great moment Almost all the church music to which it applies was written in one generation by insufficiently qualified

frequently goes with incompetence. The prohibition of the Council of Laodicea ought to be repeated and extended in each generation.

There is here no need for apportioning any blame or censure. It is natural that men in the first flush of a new technique or a new medium should so misinterpret their functions as to make ingenuity an end in itself. It is not less natural that new forms or idioms of expression should, at the moment when they appear, attract an undue amount of attention by their very novelty, it requires a certain period of sifting before their places can be determined. Even the weaklings and the sentimentalists may in their shallow measure be endeavouring to say something which they have genuinely at heart. As a rule, church music, even at its least worthy, has been free from that commercialism which is the chief enemy of art and literature. But when all this has been granted to the full we should still be left with an unflinching resolve not to admit to our church services any kind or example of music which falls short of the highest standard that it can attain.

And this for two plain reasons. First that when we call our act of worship the Service, we are dedicating it as an offering to God, and before His Altar we have no right to present anything that is blemished. And secondly our act of worship brings into the Divine Presence the soul of the worshipper, which must, therefore, be purified and uplifted to the utmost of its spiritual capacity in order that it may gain the strengthening and refreshing which no unworthy recipient has a right to ask. And if it be argued that the recipient must in all cases be unworthy, and that, therefore, any such attempt is foredoomed to failure, the answer is that this is a counsel of despair which would equally justify the abrogation of all standards in every other part of the act of

worship But, indeed, as a matter of principle we can hardly doubt that there is here a general agreement. It is needless to labour the point that when we attend the Supper of the Great King we must wear our wedding garment.

This conclusion translated into practice means the application of a critical standard and the rigorous exclusion of all that falls below it. There follows the inevitable question how and by whom this standard is to be applied, and at what point our line is to be drawn. On this point I would venture to speak with entire frankness. The standard should be applied by a council of those best fitted to speak in the name of church music, whether from the side of the Ministry or from the side of musical art or from those, of whom we have not a few in England, who can hold an authoritative balance between them, and the one general instruction under which such a council should act should be, "When in doubt exclude." Nothing, in short, should be admitted to the canon of church music which is not accepted as deserving of its place by a consensus of the liberal and trained judgment of those best fitted to pronounce. A corpus of such music could easily be prepared, some of the work has already been done in various parts of the field, it could, of course, be left open so that further additions might be made from time to time as opportunity arose. It would represent a monument of beauty and dignity and reverence as great in its way as the windows of York or the fabric of Westminster.

Here some objections should be considered. First that the exclusion of some of the works that have won their way into popular favour would give offence and would be met by resentment and alienation. I do not believe that this objection is of great moment. Almost all the church music to which it applies was written in one generation by insufficiently qualified

composers ; it is holding its place merely by use and wont ; it could be gradually and imperceptibly dropped out of use with little or no danger of offending the consciences of the congregation. I do not believe that people prefer bad music to good ; I do believe, and am indeed convinced by some half century of experience, that a vast number of people adopt no criteria of excellence at all, that on the whole they prefer any music which is rapid in movement and brief in duration, and that apart from this they do not really distinguish between one idiom and another. I had a curious illustration of this at a Sunday School Festival which once did me the honour of inviting me to preside at its annual festival. The Director had prepared a list of hymns for the occasion which included—I am speaking quite literally—some of the best and some of the worst with which I am acquainted ; melodies as far apart from each other as the poetry of Milton from the poetry of Martin Tupper. The selection made on that occasion happened to be exclusively from the worse melodies. Next year I was invited again and in accepting asked whether some principle of selection could be adopted. I received a most kindly and sympathetic answer saying that there were evidently some tunes to which I took exception and if I would indicate which these were they should be avoided on the next occasion. Nothing could have shown a more courteous desire to meet my personal wish or a more complete absence of any understanding as to the ground on which they were formed.

It may be, therefore, that too much attention has been paid to the possible discontent of those who have not really shown any very accurate powers of discrimination. The bad music of a hundred years ago when, for instance, a parody of "Rule, Britannia" was sung as a hymn, is now merely a matter of historic

or antiquarian interest, practically it has become obsolete. The rapid advance in the understanding of music which has spread through this country in the last few years is far outstripping the bad music of my own childhood, there is an increasing number of people who are offended by what is trivial or false or irreverent. It may, indeed, be urged that of this fact more account might justly be taken. We have frequently heard the plea that music of a quality acknowledged to be inferior should retain its place because "people like it", because it strikes some responsive chord of pleasure or association in some section of the worshippers. But we do not hear so much of the steadily increasing number to whom these trivialities give real pain, who are distracted by them from the true objects of worship, who are set in an atmosphere in which their souls cannot breathe freely and naturally, who—to use a more obvious metaphor—are jangled out of tune with the key of worship. It implies, surely, some ill adjustment of the balance if we are to regard those who are careless or indifferent and to leave on one side those to whom the subject is of vital importance. Part of the reason for this has already been indicated the fact that many people have never come to the realization that music can be significant and that its significance may cover the whole range from empty and trivial folly to the highest expression of the spirit of man. Those who approach the question from this standpoint are naturally incredulous or impatient when they hear that bad music can be

so soon as the principles were explained and their applicability indicated. It is not, let me repeat, a question of opposing camps or of differences of standpoint; the distinction is between those who have thought about the matter and those who have taken it for granted. And if this be so the first half of the objection falls to the ground; there can be no talk of coercion where all may be convinced. Whether or not it is advisable that there should be a single use for the whole English Church, is a matter of discipline and organization on which I have no right to express an opinion, though here, again, I might commend to my hearers the Preface on Services at the beginning of the English Prayer Book. But whether the uses be one or many, whether they be determined by central authority or gradually converge from a number of different practices, there is no reason why they should not consist exclusively of the best and noblest work. In either case the voice of praise and prayer may speak with pure accents and inspired lips, and may to the utmost of its capacity "render unto God the things that are God's."

One final word. Dr. Otto, in the work to which I have so often alluded, devotes one appendix to the question of silent worship and one most interesting passage (page 72) to the limitations of music. I am not here concerned to deny that there may be moments of silent communion, that these are, perhaps, the most intimate of all, where no articulate expression of any kind is possible, where there is hardly even consciousness, but something like the Nirvana which one of its votaries has described as "bliss unspeakable." At such a time any form of utterance may break the spell and distract the attention. Dr. Otto instances the "Sanctus" of Bach's B Minor Mass, which is a magnificent conception of its theme as regarded from outside. As we hear it we look upwards

from the earth and see the circling of an infinite heavenly host, where the morning stars sing together and the sons of God shout for joy: but it is a conception of the "Sanctus" suitable rather for the concert room than for the church. It would have been well had Dr. Otto contrasted the corresponding movement of Beethoven's great "Missa Solennis" and especially its opening, where the sound, perfectly simple and almost at lowest degree of audibility, is informed with a spiritual meaning which we seem to feel at the very centre of our soul.

To discuss this matter further would carry me beyond the limits of my theme. All I am here concerned to maintain is, that so far as utterance and expression of any kind are possible so they are at their noblest when they are heightened and transfigured by musical art. Too long have we regarded it as something external to the development of the human spirit, as some appanage or adornment or luxury which can be adopted without ennoblement or discarded without essential loss. It is something far more intimate than this. It is at the very centre and essence of our being: through it we can express thoughts that lie too deep not only for tears but for utterance; through it we can be caught up into the Divine Presence and hear those things that, because they are unspeakable, are higher and more holy than the range of any speech.

whatever kind, has no more place in the House of the Lord than the money changers had in the Temple, to leave it in possession is not charity but *incuria*

One has only to consider how such a plea would be received on any other similar question. One cannot imagine an unauthorized amateur being given a free hand to decorate the church walls, one cannot imagine the liturgy or the lessons replaced at random by some modern and unworthy substitute. Apparently it is only in the music that the priesthood is to be set aside and the preaching of Korah, Dathan and Abiram accepted as authoritative.

In the best church music can be found a response for every mood which may legitimately be admitted into worship at all. moods of praise and prayer, of penitence and exaltation, of the joy of God's House and the sacramental communion of His Presence. Its appeal is, in its place, universal for there is no noble aspect of human nature which it does not touch and no ignoble aspect which it needs to consider. To suppose that it is necessarily intricate, or elaborate—or cold and austere—or beset with difficulties—or in any way unapproachable to the plain man—all this rests on a misunderstanding of its nature and its function. In itself it is the purest expression of that state of the soul which shows itself in the act of worship, and as such it belongs to all to whom that act is a reality.

No doubt the application of this standard would discontinue a vast proportion of the music which has actually been written for use in church services. That is in itself wholly desirable, it is, indeed, one of the principal ends which reformers should have in view. In every generation false prophets have made their voices heard and the populace has accepted their message with little demur. At present we have a treasure house into which, by historic accident, a

great deal of dross has been allowed to accumulate, but which, nevertheless, contains a full abundance of pure gold. It is good that we should make a gradual clearance, discarding all that is not of the highest value and bringing back all that is into use and currency. That there is abundance lying ready to our hand is plain matter of fact, there is not the least need that any second rate work should ever be given, for there is enough first rate to fill our service books by the year together. And as it can respond to every mood of worship so it can present in performance every degree of difficulty from the simplest onwards. Nothing can be further from the truth than the belief that all good music needs costly resources and elaborately trained proficiency. The hymns in the village church which every member of the congregation can sing, may represent within their range as high a standard of composition as the anthems and canticles which are more suited to abbey and cathedral. It is not a distinction between the kinds of music with which we are here concerned but an insistence that all should be in the highest degree good of its kind. Again, I have heard men object that the imposition of a standard would introduce some element of coercion and restraint by which the freedom of worship would be impaired, and that this would be done in accordance with some arbitrary criteria which are set on no more stable foundation than individual taste. With the latter half of this objection I would venture once more to express my total disagreement. The matter is not one of fluctuating taste, but of the application of principles which, for acceptance need only to be stated. Whether they are applicable in a given instance is a matter not for dogmatic assertion but for discussion and debate. In this form of discussion I have been engaged for many years and I have never yet found a case in which we could not reach agreement.

PREPARING HIS WAY (c) BY MENTAL DEVELOPMENT (*Teaching*)

(1) By Mr R A RAVEN, M A.,
Assistant Master of Rugby School

Nor much in the way of definition nor of preface is required by one who tries to speak of the Eternal Spirit as it shews itself in the young. The young are so manifestly inhabited by a spirit, that spirit is so spontaneous and genuine, it works so freely and quickly and so unceasingly in the young, that it seems indeed that the task of us, the grown ups, is to stand aside and admire, to clear the way that the young may have an unimpeded course for their advance, and to look upon our dealings with them not under the analogy of the carpenter, to plane, saw, split and shape, nor of the blacksmith to hammer, forge and harden, but rather of the gardener, and here again to refine and to leave aside the gardener's work of lopping and pruning and transplanting, the more drastic of his ways of treating his plants, and to imitate rather his gentler methods, whereby he removes weeds from about his nurslings, fosters their growth, ministers to their needs in food and warmth and light, and finds it hard to keep pace with their amazing appetite for life. Life, that is the word for the young, life perhaps even more than love, life so wide that it embraces love, or love so wide that it grasps all life in its arms, the child at its best is a standing illustration of the point where life and love blend into one.

It has been believed that the young are full of evil, there is the old tradition that a child that howls loudly at the font is shewing healthy signs of a fierce

and final rending of the partnership between him and the devil, and this tradition represents much that has been believed and taught about the bringing up of children, of the inevitable need of the rod, and so on. And it has been fashionable of late to decry and make fun of these older beliefs which made less happy the childhood of many of us and of the great majority of our parents. Those older beliefs are by now, it seems, a corpse, and it would be profitless and ungracious to appear to drive in yet another dagger. That is a quite negative task, as was the task of looking for faults in the innocence of childhood and of scourging them thence forthwith. More profitable is it to try and see where the excellencies of childhood lie, to be aware of the pleasant places in the country of childhood and if we must exact toil and industry from the inhabitants, at any rate set up our chimneys and forges and furnaces without ruining the landscape. In other words if we *must* face children with the prospect of manhood, its labours and its responsibilities, let us at any rate see if we cannot do so without spoiling the charm, the freshness and the goodness of children.

What then is this charm, freshness and goodness?

One may begin with the child's delight in the five senses. One can recollect in one's own childhood the intense delight of such sensations as stroking a cat's fur, smelling a flower, tasting sweets, listening to rain or wind, letting water run through one's fingers and so on. How well did the authoress of the *Fairchild Family*, a book so justly ridiculed for its moral methods, understand some parts of the nature of children when she described not without a certain suitable gusto, meals in which appear cherry tart and cream. Again when Rupert Brooke in his poem *The Great Lover* catalogues many dear and familiar things that appeal to the senses, he is recording joys

that were chiefly and originally childish joys, and not trivial amusements. The lamentable loss of the freshness of experience is for most of us best put by Wordsworth in his *Ode*, when he bewails the departure of the "glory and the freshness of a dream" from our appreciation of the world around us, and it is the freshness and keenness which is the special merit of the observation of the young.

Now it is a proverbial saying that love and hate are not far removed. Indeed they have much in common. It is the natural work of love to recall the minutest details of the thing loved—whether it be the features of the face of a loved person, the very words and inflections of tone in a happy conversation, the smallest details of place in a memorable walk or excursion. The same holds true of hatred—one can recall in the tiniest detail the manners, tones and affectations of a person disliked, the very words exchanged in a quarrel, the smallest item of one's surroundings at a time of gloom or unhappiness. It is true that the will makes an effort to retain the former and to dismiss the latter, but whether retained or dismissed the memories are never blurred, whether buried or revived, *there* they are, clear and distinct. So that hatred has at any rate one function of love—the intense and close scrutiny. And probably a truer classification of one's feelings of attraction and repulsion would be to class love and hatred as two variants of the same thing, while the true contrary—the real opposite of love—is indifference and boredom.

Seen from this point of view the love, the life and the interest of children is unflagging and inexhaustible. The best of the grown-ups find it a constant stimulus; they know it is infectious, and stay where they may catch the germ; it is a confession of weakness to get away and seek for quiet, and to tell the young to run

away and play, to be seen and not heard. We exclaim with surprise when we read that Jane Austen used to write her novels in a room full of children, we ought on the contrary to admire her wisdom for having learnt to make use for her work of the first of all the stimulants. A lady took me to see her own portrait the other day, just painted and painted notably by a young artist, "and the extraordinary thing was," she said "that the children were constantly in the room and that he never seemed to mind their interruptions a bit." The truth doubtless was that the children contributed a great deal to the truth and beauty of the picture, and the artist was content to be thus helped.

The teacher's work then is both humble and responsible, humble in the admission that he has to guide only, to give opportunities, to allow to grow, to let work rather than to order, to bestir, to arouse or to create, responsible for the fear that by not knowing or watching those under his care he may so easily restrain or hamper, wound or spoil, or even poison. And here are some of the natural impulses of the child for which he has to make way and find scope, trusting the spirit that breathes these impulses to be the true and the good. First of all, perhaps including all, is the desire and ambition to grow, to gain power. This certainly includes an intense desire to learn. There is no reason for thinking that the process of attaining knowledge need be in any way a tedious one. With small people it very seldom is, even supposing that children are the victims of really blundering and bad teachers. It always seems to me that the learning of reading must have been the most unfamiliar and the most exhausting task of our lives. I shudder to contemplate the possibility of being now at my present age faced by another such task. Yet who has heard of an average child who

has failed to learn how to read? And there are other tasks of learning which the child easily achieves with an immense capacity for further acquisition of knowledge. Later perhaps something may be said of the reason why school work is disliked, but no one can be unaware of the immense self imposed labours that boys undertake. Everyone knows boys who can produce at will long lists of cricketers complete with initials representative of every county or who are capable of detailed descriptions of endless makes of motor cars or, if their hobbies have taken them into quieter places who can produce at will quite as many facts about birds or flowers or moths or beetles.

Then beside this great appetite for knowledge is the appetite for doing things and for learning how to do them. There is little doubt that we do not tap with anything like sufficient current the reservoir of childish energy. We are too afraid of allowing things into children's hands either because we fear for the child or because we fear for what he is handling. And we do far too much for children postponing the moment when they should be doing things for themselves. We are fearful of their touching or handling common objects of household use we only allow them *playthings* keeping them back in the realm of make belief when they are urgent to tread firmly on the solid soil of a real world. And yet sometimes when we are forced by circumstances to entrust small responsibilities to children do they not rise to the occasion? How often in a poverty stricken household where the mother is dead or handicapped do we know of boys and girls managing affairs with much level headed capacity! So seldom do we really try to let young children manage things.

And then again in the class room we must ask ourselves are we letting grow or are we hampering? If

we could only get rid of our familiarity with the common spectacle of desks and benches and could step into a modern school with unprejudiced and otherworld eyes, how fatuous would appear to us the rows of active bodied and busy minded children sitting in numbered positions and often in constrained attitudes, and how utterly unsuited to the natural aptitudes and requirements of youth ! No wise teacher will try to thwart the restlessness of children. There is of course a restlessness that gets in the way of other children, but that is a lesson which groups of young ones often learn by themselves, and the happiest roomful of them is full of various activities going on side by side without interfering with one another. Indeed this, it seems to me, is one of the great lessons taught by Madame Montessori.

Next I come to another symptom of the child's inspiration, his desire to make and create. Here is to be found and to be cherished the most sacred of all human impulses if for one reason only. For this is the impulse upon which finally depends the propagation of our species, the guarantee of our posterity, and upon the wise or unwise treatment of this impulse depends to some extent the fertility or barrenness of the race, and the happiness of the individual. For the child who has learnt early to turn in many directions, artistic or mechanical, the natural impulse to create, develops into the man who can satisfy happily both the imperious demands of his nature and the rigid requirements of modern civilization. In the school this love of creating blends itself with the activity already spoken of, it shews itself in making mud patties in moulding plasticine or clay in carpentering and hammering, it rises to painting to writing poetry and plays and music and to all the thousand ways in which a child sets itself to create. And this goes deeper. For the child has a strong emotional

nature, he needs an easy play for his emotions, not the contrast between long reserve and violent passionate outburst which is found in some children, but the steady devotion of feeling to an ideal, which he should, if possible, be trying to express in some artistic form of creation. It is a point which hardly needs labouring to day, so frequently is this truth made clear by modern writers and psychologists, but it is a matter of great importance and could hardly be omitted in any kind of survey.

Nor can a child's appetite for growth be spoken of without mentioning its desire to excel. Now there is no doubt that children of a certain age, boys at the preparatory school age for example, are like young saplings in a copse, each thrusting up its head with all possible vigour for light and air and ruthlessly, even cruelly, striving with its neighbour and often stifling it. I believe that we make much too much of the emulous and competitive spirit in schools. The aims of a system of emulation are obvious, but it is doubtful whether in schools we pick the right age for applying such methods, and it is quite certain that they are in no easy harmony with Christ's teaching. For example, it seems possible that the whole of the mark system which we apply so much in schools is false and harmful, and that systems of individual rivalry, such as in running races, or offering cricket bats for the highest individual batting average, are as bad. Probably the truth is that the abundant spirit of rivalry of young people at this age is in reality a rivalry against their weaker selves. Every boy thirsts for constant proof that he is getting stronger and taller and wiser and fuller of knowledge, this is natural enough, and it is natural enough too that in schools and in families the standard of measurement should be that of one's neighbours. Everyone knows how brothers squabble,

when the elder is not far enough ahead to be a hero or to be out of the reach of the rivalry of the younger. Everyone remembers those queer little alliances and clans that coalesce between preparatory school boys, with some secret code of language or other mark of exclusive power, only to dissolve as quickly. All these are symptoms of the intense desire to grow, and perhaps we allow the boy too many opportunities of comparing himself with others, and not enough of comparing himself with his past and outgrown self. In any case this is only a stage, and a far finer one begins to come with adolescence, for here perhaps, for the first time, the boy begins to feel that need to devote himself to others which for us older ones alone makes life liveable, and often he plunges into the new element with the same headlong abandonment as into a noon day swimming pool. I spoke of the child's capacity to love, and spoke of it rather as absorption in life. The small child's love is of everything around it, of things, of doings, of people and places almost indiscriminately—of life in general. That special meaning put by elders into love, the love of other people, does not seem to stand out at once in the young till the age which is generally, but not very scientifically, described as the beginning of adolescence. Here, however, one gets the finest flower of youth. The analogy of the thrusting sapling no longer holds, a boy of 14 or 15 needs more than anything else to join himself to a group, and to devote to that group an almost passionate loyalty. Yet the keen sight and observation, the intense physical enjoyment of the world, the insatiable curiosity, and the springy resilience of childhood, with all its old objectivity is still there. Whether it is the duty of the wise teacher to train a boy at this stage, or merely to feed him by providing the various needs of his age, is questionable. But it is certain

that the attitude towards the boy in those who hold authority over him matters as much now as ever

As he changes from childhood to manhood a boy becomes aware of a change in himself. New powers are developing, faster than ever, and in some ways they are strange, even alarming ones. He is puzzled, he is perhaps not sure of himself. It matters very much here how he is treated. He will very likely need guidance, he is not very likely to come and ask for it, he is much more likely to imitate what appear to be sound examples. But appearance is not always reality, companions who may appear to take manhood familiarly are perhaps merely covering their qualms by assumed bravado. In any case imitation is inferior to real experience, and it is far better that a boy should trust himself and be self-reliant, welcome his new powers with faith and be certain that the many new stirrings are natural and good. It is about now, I believe, that a boy's earlier training is going to bear serious fruit, it is about now that the management of himself is going to be his own affair whether successful or unsuccessful, and it is about now that we can consider what the teacher should have been doing so far.

What then has the teacher done to foster that eternal spirit of life and love which has been breathing through his pupils? Has he sternly made up his mind what is wanted and insisted on demanding that from his children and nothing else? Has he scolded and driven or has he been patient and encouraging? Has he been merciless to inadequacy, and if he has found only warmth where he wanted a bright blaze has he stamped his foot on the smoulder and put it out? Or has he been much wiser and looked round for whatever life he could find and wherever he could find it? Has he cherished all that was living, sheltered and fed all the heat he

could find, and *not* stamped his foot and quenched the smoking flax?

He will be wise, I believe, to encourage the small child's delight in the five senses, for he will know that through the senses, working with the minute and curious observation of a child, come love and knowledge, and also with the corollary we have noticed, hate and knowledge, and knowledge coming through observation, means truth and familiarity with things, and familiarity, even with evil, if it is the familiarity of clear impartial observation, while it sometimes breeds contempt, also destroys fear. That is always the final aim—the destruction of fear, and the giving of scope for familiarity, love and trust in the world to fill out the child's life. Nor will the teacher ever wish a child not to ask questions. He will remember that the child longs to learn and will remember all that it is interested in. He should answer as many questions as he can and where he cannot answer, he must direct children to people or books where the answers are to be had. He will remember that unsatisfied curiosity is a morbid state of mind, and that where gaps in knowledge cannot be filled with fact, they will certainly be filled with fancy, and that often when a puzzled child has asked a question and not been satisfied his curious mind, like an imprisoned gnat will buzz its vaporous wings round the hard walls of the problem with a futile and morbid persistency of fanciful solutions.

Not that there is any harm in childish fancy, it is a common enough feature, though generally dispensed with by the time the infant school stage is over. After that the teacher will have the task of seeing that in matters of knowledge fancy is not playing its hazy part where duty requires the discovering of fact, and when a child brings to him a matter of speculation he will have the task of guiding that speculation along

the lines of adherence to what is probable rather than of attraction to what is desirable. He will teach him to build castles, but not in the air, and the child will know the delights of solid building. Everyone who knows himself at all well knows how fancy roams along pleasant paths, upwards into the impossible, away from the true, avoiding facts, picturing delights, and leading to the goal of imaginary self-gratification. If possible, and I believe it is possible, a teacher can show a child how to use his fancy not as a pleasant will-of-the-wisp, but as imagination of the true; to combine old truths and facts in new ways, so as to form no shadowy hallucinations or mirages, but some sound mental construction that will stand the shocks of reality in the future. But such faculties in children are elusive, and the teacher will find that just where he thought he had planted a seed there is no growth, and where he knows he has not sown, just *there* there is visible fertility. So he will probably be content with the plain task of feeding the appetite for knowledge.

Nor will he forget the appetite for activity. He will never curb the restlessness of a child except where it is hindering another child. Restlessness is merely a symptom of energy unoccupied. Not all teachers realize that to make a child sit still and sit up, "hands on desk and feet crossed" (one has heard the order) is calling upon it to perform a very hard task, all the harder because it is unnatural. How much attention does such a teacher seriously expect to get to his lesson or lecture if he has already given his class the exhausting duty of keeping still? He will get much more attention probably from the boy who is lolling on one arm and quietly but steadily exercising his surplus energy on sketching horses or motor-cars with the other hand, the bulk of that boy's energy may very likely be going into his work, the surplus is being

quietly employed and not struggling against a cramping curb, witness the story of Sir Walter Scott's button. Anyhow the teacher will recognize the need for his class to be active, his voice will not be heard too often, duties of opening windows, fetching books, writing on blackboards and all the other activities of an ordinary classroom will be delegated to the pupils, and if he is clever, he will do what many modern teachers do, and bring as much activity into the work of his class as he can, in the form of acting and singing and dancing and other healthful activities that are creeping into our timetables.

Nor will he forget how essential it is that children in their activity should create. All healthy children are busy making something, and as I have said before when this making, as it so often is, is an emotional as well as an active occupation, so much the better for the child. Our use of language brings us into a kind of paradox on this point, for the child who is constantly giving play to his emotions is the contrary of what we call the emotional child. The latter is rather one who cannot manage his emotions successfully, the former is one who can manage them with ease, giving them all plenty of play in due season and saving himself from what are very correctly termed "outbursts." The successful teacher will turn his pupils into the former kind. Whether he will train them by the more violent emotional exercises of singing, playing instruments, reciting, dancing and so on, or by the slower arts of painting and drawing, writing prose and verse, carving making boats and so forth is perhaps a question to be put to an expert authority. In either case he will be ministering to their activity and giving play to their emotions, and generally fostering that eternal spirit which is theirs.

Then how will he deal with that longing to excel? He will make his comparisons, I think, always between a pupil's present and his past, *not* between two boys, and he will find many opportunities to praise, and omit many opportunities of blame. Blaming is a negative job, praising is a positive and constructive one. Blaming is talking about faults, dwelling as it were, on sin—breathing the less clear air. Praising is the considering of excellence, the living with what is good, sitting in the sun, and a wise teacher will praise where he can and encourage, and he will at times stop and measure to his class or to his pupil the progress made in a certain space of time. Moreover he will put more and more responsibility on his boys' shoulders, he will trust them more and more with their own time and how to map it out, with their own methods and conceptions of how to tackle their work. For every time that he can safely omit to say "You shall do this and that," or "You shall work thus and thus," he is tacitly saying to his boys "You are old and wise enough now to settle this for yourselves, I need treat you no longer as children," and no treatment develops, encourages and ministers to the desire to excel more than that, just as no words exasperate boys or tempt to revolt more quickly, than "You will understand that when you are older" or "You are too young to have this explained to you now."

Finally as his boys approach adolescence and are already groping towards manhood, and perhaps finding that where they knew themselves and were sure of themselves, they are now developing afresh and have much of the work of self discovery to do all over again, their teacher must be ready to explain and to discuss with them—not for a moment laying down the law what they are to think or to do, but getting their points of view and discussing these,

remembering that any decision to be made, any line of conduct to be adopted, should be put on the boy's initiative, to do what *he* thinks best and not what he is *told* to be right

At this point perhaps three crucial duties of the teacher may be enumerated. They are not merely duties of the teacher, they are duties of all of us; but the teacher, like the father, or the preacher, or the writer is so often the source of instruction, and his actions seem to derive such authority from his position, that they are specially important.

The first is self knowledge. There can be no doubt that with all the variations of human individuality human beings are alike. We are all compounded of the same ingredients, and if each of us knew sufficiently well the corners and by ways of his own nature, he knows those of others. The people whom we have found most helpful in our own puzzles, are always those who are unsurprised by what we tell or confess, they seem "to have been there before," as we say. If a teacher knows himself well, how easily can he explain and sympathize with his pupils' difficulties—that difficulty of concentration, that boredom of a certain subject, the incapacity to be original, the hopeless shyness, the self consciousness, the dumbness in company, and if he has experienced all these symptoms and many others, whether hindrances or helps, whether paralysis or exuberance of powers, he can be the true interpreter and the real help.

Second is the real pit fall of teachers, where and when to pass moral judgments. It is an universal, but I believe quite wrong, custom that teachers should have the duty of awarding praise and blame. As things are, the duty cannot well be avoided, while marks are allotted to work, high marks or low marks imply favour or disfavour. At the foot of

terminal school reports a space marked "Industry" seems to call for an important moral judgment, and the vicious circle being well established teachers pass naturally beyond critical judgments on matters of instruction to moral judgments on all points, till many of us appear to be always answering the question "was it right or was it wrong?" and finally passing into a habitual state of mind in which we are constantly expressing approval or disapproval—a horribly pharisaical attitude to which schoolmasters are specially prone and in which we beg the world's indulgence and if possible its prayers. We must school ourselves to toleration, or we shall breed intolerance and pharisaism in our boys, we must remember those tolerant words "I came not to judge the world" and that the *true* judge is just that spirit of truth which we find in our boys and hope to cherish in them. So that when his verdict is asked on any point, I am sure the schoolmaster is right if he disclaims any power to judge and merely shifts the responsibility for judgment to the shoulders of the author of the doubtful action. His task is to find the good and use it.

Third is the supreme duty of removing fear out of all his dealings with his pupils. Doubtless this is an ideal counsel and if only for disciplinary purposes punishments may have to be inflicted or the fear of the rod implicit but that is the necessity of an imperfect state of affairs. Freedom must be brought into all our work, if that work is to have any quality in it, and if all is well a boy should be able to say and write whatever he likes and how he likes, constrained only by his sense of what he thinks fitting, and not by his fear of what he thinks his master may think unfitting. There is no more lamentable sight than that of a big active man dominating a class of youngsters, till their only aim is to obey commands

and till it has ceased to be an experience with them to make a choice of any kind. Nor must children be made to feel the consequences of their actions. How can a child ever get to love animals if the first time it meets one it is told "Mind the cat doesn't scratch you!" Or how can a child be at ease at a tea party if its last injunction before setting out has been "Mind you aren't naughty!" It is early that such a crop is sown, and such children when they meet the schoolmaster are so busy minding this and minding that, that he will have a hard task to make them free from fears and happy at their work. Not only must the master relieve his pupils of all fear of himself, he must do what he can to remove from them the fear of each other. We all know how grinding school-boy convention can be, and the fear of that can as a rule be only combated indirectly. But an atmosphere of freedom can do much, and is happily infectious and extraordinarily attractive. No boy is more popular with his fellows than one who is free from the fear of convention. When the boy sits down to work and has no lurking thought at the back of his mind "What does Mr. X want?", but only the thought "how shall I enjoy dealing with this subject?" the first result is an immense improvement in the quality of the work itself. Every teacher worth his salt knows how cheerfulness in the room and pleasure in the work leads first to ease in working, then to quality in the results, and very often to real beauty in what is produced. Freedom and fearlessness means also freedom to go wrong, but the wise teacher who has got his class free will not be in the least alarmed or put out by any missteps. It is here that fear and the passing of moral judgments can combine into an unholy alliance. If something really untoward happens, if, shall we say, a 'scene' occurs, it is difficult not to be ruffled. The most free and fearless

man is quite calm and will express no opinion, nor will he be in a hurry to do so later. While emotion is still swelling in the sufferer's bosom, if the boy is still angry, or tearful, or excited in some way or another, little can be done. However, when the situation is over, and when emotion is dead, and when, if there was a penalty, the penalty is paid and the sting gone, then a cool discussion of what happened, looked at objectively, almost scientifically, is of the greatest help. Public schoolboys will look back reflectively at the selfish individualism of their preparatory school period and mark clearly what has happened. A calm child who can coolly see why it was once in a tantrum is not very likely to relapse, boys who discuss calmly the pros and cons of cribbing are not likely to treat the matter lightly again.

Self knowledge, the undesirability of passing judgments, and the desirability of freedom from fear have been taken separately, but they are only three aspects of the same thing, and that is the emancipation of the schoolboy and setting free in him of the spirit which was so vigorous in him when a small child. Now how is it that that spirit has been curbed, when it should have been as free as the wind "blowing where it listeth, not knowing whence it came and whither it goeth"? and I fear a full answer will be a series of "Don'ts" for parents and teachers. Let us take first the child's eagerness to learn, why is it that some hate school and cannot learn? Latin is for many the bugbear, Mathematics for others, all book work for others again. Some mishandling is surely to be detected. Children have been taught that which they ought not to have been taught, and they have not been taught that which they ought to have been taught, and there is no health in them. Or else a malign power of suggestion has been at work, a suggestion often made quite unwittingly

Perhaps when the small boy has been getting ready to go to his first school his anxious mother has warned him that his Latin will be very hard and that he must do his *very* best, or his genial father has pictured for him a playful reminiscence in which Latin Grammar and canes were blended. If so, the harm is already done. The boy approaches the thus labelled subject with fear, he expects to find it hard and to fail, and so he does, till the thing becomes a habit and eight years later he tells his master in the Vth form—"Sir, I never was any good at Latin—I shall be ploughed in the certificate." "Thus old experience doth attain To something like prophetic strain." But we may ask in this quarrel as in many others—"Who began it?" The evil results may be of two kinds, generally the boy's ability is diverted, sometimes it is really stunted. The harm is generally done at the beginning, and the teacher who comes later has often to entice a shy and hiding faculty out of its shell. He may not succeed, but he cannot unless he begins by surrounding the boy and the difficult subject with all the pleasure, ease and delight he can possibly devise. Humour, sympathy, encouragement, taking it easy, and so on, are the only splints to help the broken leg to mend, and he has to work patiently till the boy can take joy and pride in the work before he can expect any quality in it. Driving and hectoring on the other hand is fatal. And if boys are sluggish and inactive, that may be the result of some such treatment when they have been overdone, and now they are taking, probably without knowing it, a rest. A boy may have some obvious weakness, I am thinking of one in particular, rather undergrown and certainly lacking in energy. As he moved through his school from the bottom upwards all his masters passed the same strictures, the very same doubtless that he passed daily on himself, that he

lacked energy ; till at last the thing became so familiar a truism, a situation that he was so sick of, that there was no way out for him, at any rate till he should leave school and get a change of scene. Other boys never learn the splendid object lessons of doing things with their hands, and never get a chance of exercising their creativeness, their education is entirely bookish, and their subsequent practical inadequacy in a world of taps, and hinges, electric switches and magnetos is lamentable. Others, again, have been kept children, they have not had responsibility given them, things have been always done for them ; their opinion has never been consulted, they are not allowed to choose their own clothes, to manage their own money. These either remain children and refuse responsibility when they do get it, or rush into whatever spurious form of being grown up they can get, and naturally earn the derogatory epithet of being "mannish". In many cases the results seem almost mathematical, the boy who has been ill treated becomes himself a bully, the boy who has received little affection and of whom little affection has been asked either encloses himself in a hard shell of cold individuality, or suddenly emerges from his dark prison with one of those violent and sentimental attachments which are so awkward, so little returned, so touching and in many ways so genuine. One can trace the sources of selfishness, greed, unpopularity, conceit and other youthful ailments to their many sources. Nor do schoolmasters always use a lucky finger in making virtues attractive. The eternal lecture upon punctuality and unpunctuality makes the keeping of appointments a hideous nightmare for the conscientious, a matter of unimportance to the casual-minded, wrongly conceived homilies on strong language sometimes cause a subsequent emptying of public of the entire vocabulary, over-emphasized

urgings to esprit de corps defeat their own ends, and the less said about some sermons in School Chapels the better. All this can be destructive when it is meant to be constructive, and often comes about when elders wish to improve and advance boys by unwanted advice. They forget that every boy is trying very hard to improve himself, and that *there* he holds a very serious if carefully concealed responsibility, and that it is just *there* that he hates interference.

It is largely by freedom and trust that British education is unique in the world. But we do not always understand the secret of the instrument we are wielding. So often do our codes of rules of behaviour fall into the negative "Thou shalt not", or the exact command "Thou must", when very often it is much better not to legislate at all. After all, that eternal spirit is always driving forward, whence and whither one knows not, and to check it, canalize it, dam it or divert it is impertinence. The best teaching knows there is good in all, it breaks off constraint wherever it can, it makes possible all forms of enterprise. It encourages all forms of self devotion and education, it never dogmatizes, it is happy, and it sets free an enormous power of good, and the results are often astounding. One has seen the possibilities in individual cases where in separate boys the spirit has blown unhindered. Their capacity for learning and enterprise, their activity and their influence on others has been immeasurable. One has seen it working through a whole school, and found over and above a strong basis of industry in work and energy in play, a special crop of artistic creativeness and joy, finding an outlet in music and painting and poetry and in drama, in special thoughtfulness on serious matters in special charity to less happy neighbours, in special trust and dependence

on one another, and in special comprehension and enjoyment of religion

The times at least are hopeful. The age where duty came first and love afterwards is going, and perhaps the right order is coming when love will come first and duty is bound to follow. If the path of duty was, as it deserves to be, the way to glory, it must be remembered that there are more unselfish things than glory, and that love takes unselfishness for granted. I believe that we are arriving at a more understanding love of childhood and a more understanding love of the needs of the young. Likewise we are learning to love life more and to consider it less a serious matter than a happy one. The freedom, versatility, activity and artistry of many of our modern schools, and the growth of the public opinion that appreciates and supports their work, point perhaps, who knows, to such a generation as we have never before had.

I have not yet said a word on religious instruction and yet I believe that the principles I have tried to maintain could not possibly, in practice, be alien to or independent of Christianity. One thing is certain. It is quite clear that if freedom and fearlessness can once gain a firm hold on a boy or school religious discussion and enquiry will immediately be a quick and strong growth. Whether that growth will contain itself adequately in the forms usually provided for it in schools is very doubtful. It will undoubtedly permeate the life of the school in the healthiest way and far beyond the walls of the chapel. Boys of that type will be eager to learn, and will be restless of narrow dogmatism, and I think they will find for themselves a Christianity well worth having.

PREPARING HIS WAY (c) BY MENTAL DEVELOPMENT

THE CHANGING FORMS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

(ii) By THE REV J GAMBLE, M A , B D ,
Canon Residentiary of Bristol

THE title of this paper may seem to call for a brief explanation. By the forms of thought I mean the moulds which in each age stand waiting for the thoughts of men, and into which these thoughts spontaneously pass, just as a stream passes into the channels prepared for it. The moulds are created by the general position which at the time knowledge has reached. They are the result of the scientific, political, historical and literary experience of mankind or any section of mankind at any particular moment.

Thus, if we think of medical knowledge, it is plain that a new form was created for medical research and speculation by the discovery of the circulation of the blood. This discovery effected a marked division between those who dealt previously with health and disease and those who dealt with them subsequently. It was not merely that an isolated addition had been made to medical knowledge. The subject had passed into a fresh stage. A new mould had been created by which all thought on the subject would henceforth be shaped or modified.

Similarly, the political experience of mankind makes the utopias or ideal commonwealths of modern thinkers markedly different from those of Plato or even Sir Thomas More. Some of the paths followed by these great thinkers have been decisively barred. New paths have been opened. The perfect state

beckons us towards it as urgently as ever, while our conceptions of its nature and the method of its attainment have greatly changed

Another, and perhaps still more relevant illustration, may be drawn from history. The tests of historical validity are for us far more severe than for previous ages, the evidence asked for is much more exacting. Confronted by an ecclesiastical miracle, e.g., we cannot ask, as Newman did, "Why should it not have happened?" and allow our belief or disbelief to depend upon the answer. Considerations, ignored by him, force themselves unbidden upon our minds, and it may well be that, although we should wish to believe, we find that we cannot. The state of knowledge and opinion at the time might have created the supposed miracle, although it never took place.

Equally potent are the literary forms which religious belief uses and then discards. Great writers such as Milton and Bunyan create a religious imagery which lasts for centuries. The songs of a nation are according to the well known saying more powerful than its laws. Our popular hymns at present fall admittedly far behind the existing state of knowledge. A great religious poet is urgently needed. 'Next to a sound rule of faith there is nothing of so much consequence as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical religion'—So the advertisement to *The Christian Year* assures its readers.

Thus when I speak of the changing forms of religious thought, I am not thinking of religious beliefs once held and now abandoned but of the varying shapes which thought, under the influence of science, history, philosophy and poetry creates and uses.

And for the explanation of these changes, I wish,

not to advance a theory of my own, but to fix your attention upon the authoritative interpretation actually given in the one book of the New Testament where the subject is directly dealt with, and a singularly impressive view is taken of the religious history of mankind.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, like the other books of the New Testament, was written to satisfy some actual need, or to avert some threatening danger in the life of the expanding Church. It had an immediate and practical object. Its readers were bewildered when they contemplated the disappearance of the Jewish religious system, divinely authenticated though it had been. They asked whether anything could be permanent in a world where a change such as this was possible. The writer had thus to show, that although the form of thought had changed, and the old mould been broken up, the life-giving stream continued to flow, and had shaped for itself a new and better receptacle. Old things had indeed passed away but they had passed away by becoming new. "The more we penetrate the meaning of this book," we may say with a recent expositor,¹ "the more we discover that this unknown writer is dealing with the vital issues of the Christian message. Under the forms and the language of a bygone age, he is facing the same problems that perplex us to-day. In our struggle with these problems, we can still go back to this teacher of the early Church, and find strength and guidance."

The truth of these words is brought home when we remember that religion and philosophy are engaged in a common quest. The saint and the philosopher both desire to approach that ultimate Reality which philosophy may hesitate to name, and which religion calls God. The pathway to Reality is for religion the ascent of God's holy hill.

¹ E. F. Scott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*. T. & T. Clark, 1922.

Spinoza would agree with St. John that the knowledge of God constitutes man's highest blessedness.

It is, therefore, of deep significance to find, in the inspired book of Christians, one treatise where the writer indicates, incidentally indeed but with great clearness, the nature of the soul's quest, and the success to which it may hope to attain.

For him, as for Plato, there were two worlds, which he distinguishes as "upper" and "lower" or "heavenly" and "earthly." In the upper world are the realities to which the things beneath point, or which they symbolize. The realities are "eternal," not in the sense that they persist without change through time, but in the sense that they have no relation to time. Of this Platonic distinction which had reached him through the religious thinkers of Alexandria, our writer makes, as I believe, an original use.

It becomes in his hands the basis of a far-reaching doctrine of symbol and reality. The things of the "lower" or phenomenal world receive from him the significant name of *shadows*. The meaning he puts upon this word needs to be carefully noted. In our ordinary speech a shadow is something either unsubstantial or disturbing. It has the first of these meanings in Burke's exclamation: "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue!" It has the other sense when we speak of a landscape as chilled by the passing cloud-shadows. We must put away these depreciatory associations which now cling to the word. For our writer the shadows are the heralds of coming good things.¹ They are themselves good although they announce things still better. The real world announces its presence by a succession

¹ As in Campbell's *Lochiel's Warning*.

"'Tis the sunset of life gives me mystical lore
And coming events cast their shadows before"

of these revealing shadows, which indicate the reality with increasing vividness as the ages pass. In no case are the shadows misleading or treacherous. They are Divinely given, valuable and trustworthy, although to the end they remain symbols of unseen realities.

Such is the writer's conception of religious progress. It is pictured as never ending. Christians have fuller light than their predecessors. But they also see the real world only with the eye of faith (xi, 1). Thus it is not that God withholds His life giving secrets from the earlier generations that He may reveal them all at once to their descendants. His revelations are in each case proportionate to the receptiveness of those who receive them. And for all alike the ultimate reality remains invisible until humanity has run its course (xi, 40, xii, 22).

The nature of the spiritual progress thus indicated will become apparent if we look at the two transformations by which he illustrates it. These are the gradual transfigurations in the growing light first of *law* and secondly of *priesthood*.

(a) The *laws* of early ages were, as we know, customs invested with sacred authority by reason of their immemorial antiquity. The custom had to be obeyed because no one could remember a time when it was not obeyed. The teeth must be pulled out, or the feet squeezed, because they always had been. Primitive law is thus beyond criticism. The reason is not allowed to work upon it. On the other hand our modern laws derive a large part of their force from the consent of the governed. "You cannot," said Burke, "bring an indictment against a nation." When the entire nation breaks the law, the law is held to have lost its validity.

Obedience to primitive laws could thus only be willing as long as it remained mechanical. As soon

as reflection began, obedience would become burdensome and precarious. The law was only secure as long as it was not examined. When examination began, the foundations began to shake. When the question came to be asked: "Why should I obey?" the answer: "You must obey because people have always obeyed," was found unsatisfying. The authority of custom broke, and the law lost its hold.

As soon as the consent of the governed has been heartily given, then a marked change takes place. The law which was before external passes inwards, and becomes the bidding of a man's own spirit. The will of God becomes his own will. He is glad to obey. The law is within his heart, and he is content to do it (*Ps. xl. 10*). Duty becomes to him a stern and yet a gracious law-giver, and he says with Wordsworth:

"Stern Lawgiver! yet thou dost wear
The Godhead's most benignant grace,
Nor know we anything as fair
As is the smile upon thy face."

The progress from the one kind of law to the other may be illustrated by that ambiguous word "sacrifice." The sacrifices of ancient religion can hardly have been more than expressions of allegiance to a tribal or national deity. The spirit of the worshipper can seldom have been deeply moved. The offering was made for, and not by him. Nothing was expected of him but that he should bear the cost. When we pass from this mechanical obedience to any of those surrenders of place, or wealth, or life itself, which we should think worthy of the name of sacrifice, we find that the author of these receives, in the sense of spiritual freedom and joy which he gains, more than the equivalent of what he surrenders. A man who pays off the load of his father's debts, a woman who

relinquishes some career which she loves in obedience to a filial call, would say that it would be harder to refrain from these surrenders, painful though they may seem to others, than to make them.

So the law of Christ, our writer would say, is one which the believer lays upon himself. It is a willing conformity, on his part, to his Master's experience. He is drawn by the "cords of a man, and the bands of love." He assents to what he does, and thus, in all his privations, he remains a free man (x. 16; viii. 10)

(b) The conception of *priesthood* suffers a like transfiguration. The hereditary priesthood of ancient religion makes way for a spiritual and consequently real priesthood. The authority of the real priest rests upon self conquest, and upon a knowledge of human nature (v 4, 7-10). He knows what sin is, because he has striven with it himself. He does not contemplate the transgressions of his fellows from the standpoint of untempted virtue. He will seldom commit himself to unqualified condemnations, because he knows that such condemnations are seldom deserved. Yet he is undefiled by the sin which he so well understands. No external appointment can make such priests. The title may be conferred by human authority, but the qualifications will not necessarily follow the title. Whereas the qualifications may be present where no human authority has intervened. Melchizedek, the priest-king of early Jewish story, who comes, one knows not whence, and goes, one knows not whither, who has no human credentials—he, and not the official, hereditary Aaron, becomes the prototype of the Christ. The eternal religion, the writer would say, does not discard priesthood. It only supplants shadow by substance, symbol by reality. Christ is the spiritual reality—the Eternal Priest whom the shadow heralded. He is this, first by reason of a Divine Vocation, and secondly

in virtue of that fellow feeling with humanity, which He gained amidst the conflicts and sorrows of His troubled days. Passing through this school of suffering He entered the higher world, and became the Eternal Priest, the pattern of all earthly priests.

To the Jewish worshipper the spectacle of the high priest, raising the curtain and entering once a year within the veil, can hardly have been more than a ceremonial incident. The spirit of the Christian disciple follows Christ, not at long intervals but habitually, into the presence of God. The intervening veils—whether they are thought of as fleshly or spatial—for the writer makes use of both conceptions x 20, iv 14—are penetrated or overcome. The spirit approaches God, feels its oneness with Him, and enjoys the sense of pardon and the peace of eternal life.

Such is the view of man's religious progress which we reach with the help of this deep thinking writer. The past, as he sees it, is an onward movement towards a real or eternal world. In the progress symbols, or, as he calls them, shadows make way for realities. The spirit becomes more and more conscious of itself, is more deeply moved and more firmly held, by the worship it offers and the law it obeys. What was mechanical becomes spontaneous, what was perfunctory becomes heartfelt. The movement is towards a greater reality, because it is towards a larger and more intense spiritual life.

The goal of the whole progress—the heavenly or eternal world—is beyond us, and cannot be brought within the reach of our present vision. It cannot be pictured in terms of space or time. It is not a locality, nor is it an endless succession of years. But it is not an hallucination, or fancy. It is the consummation to which the whole history of the human spirit points.

From this higher world we are separated by no barriers of time or space. No deep gulf is fixed between earth and heaven. Heaven is not a remote elysium to which we are admitted at death. It is the actual abiding-place of those who look to Jesus, who learn His great secret and share His eternal life. To do this they need above all things to *see* the eternal world and to live in its presence (xi. 1, 27.)

What makes such vision difficult is the tyranny of visible things. Overpowered by this tyranny we sell our heavenly citizenship for a mess of pottage (xii. 16). If we could look through the things seen to the things not seen, or, in other words live in the world of reality, and not in the world of appearance, the occurrences of the passing day would, for us also, as for St. Paul, work out an exceeding weight of glory (2 Cor. iv. 17, 18).

Such a life can only be the outcome of spiritual habit. The will must be brought into exercise (xii. 1.) There are no short-cuts to the desired end. The power cannot be acquired by trying to escape from the worries of every-day life, and seeking shelter in seclusion. This would only be to repeat the experience of the early solitaries. Nor must the soul be thought of as imprisoned within the body and panting for its release. Body and soul form one organism, and both must be used as instruments for reaching the heavenly vision (cp., e.g., xiii. 1, 9).

The practical consequences of this sublime conception of religious progress claim our best attention. The provisional and prophetic character of our religious institutions should never be forgotten. The greatest as well as the least of them should be regarded as symbols of realities to which they point, but which they cannot fully represent. We should not claim for the symbol more than by its name it claims for itself. We eat, e.g., the Flesh and drink

the Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, but we may eat the flesh also in the fruit of honest toil and drink the blood out of the chalice of suffering. The Church's ministries will have an increased value in our eyes if we steadily remember the churchless city towards which they point. The Christian teacher, again, will claim for his words no greater authority than that of a faithful interpreter of spiritual experience which his pupils can verify for themselves.

One great help in the life-long struggle thus ensuing is the sense of companionship. The present runners in the race of life are surrounded by a large number of consenting witnesses, who are near although invisible. Those enumerated by this writer were not faultless heroes. They represent various moral codes, and some of them hardly even reached the low standard of the rough ages in which they lived. (xi. 31, 32). The value of their testimony arises from the fact that they trusted their aspirations, and thus earned a reward greater than they knew (xi. 39, 40).

At no point does the vision shine with a more welcome radiance than in its bearing upon eschatology. The traditional Christian eschatology now lies around us in ruins. The three-storied world has become the laughing-stock of the scientist—a *ludibrium ventis*. This inspired writer enables us to rest the hope of immortality upon a far firmer foundation. We see man moving on into ever-widening hopes and ampler prospects, and thus learning to believe that God keeps in store for him things greater than he knows how to pray for (xi. 40). He may try to visualize the object of his desire by the aid of the pictorial imagination, and dream of unending years, of streets of gold, and gates of pearl. These images are good in their time, but gradually fade in the growing light. The hope itself is, however, no illusion. It is a sure prophecy,

proving itself by real although partial fulfilments, and pointing onwards towards a state of being of which the spirit has, in its best moments, convincing assurance

Thus, if human life be judged by its visible achievements, the civilizations it builds up, the books it writes, the pictures it paints, it may indeed fulfil Mr Bertrand Russell's forecast, and be a temple destined to be buried beneath the *débris* of a universe in ruins, but if the aspirations of man be taken into account as surely they must, for they are as inseparable from our nature as are our bodily appetites, then the history of these aspirations—the part they have already played, the fulfilments they have already received—enables us to disregard the downfall of the material temple. It becomes the prophecy of another and better fabric of which it was never more than the revealing shadow.

If this be the way of the Eternal Spirit we may have good hope for the future. You may have seen the contrivance by which wood in the Alps is brought down from the uplands to the valleys beneath. The logs are fixed upon wires supported by a succession of uprights and then hurry down by their own weight. When the log reaches the upright support there is a momentary pause. But the obstacle is soon overcome and the motion is resumed. So the spiritual progress of mankind may seem to be checked by obstacles arising from scientific discoveries or political and social readjustments. The onward movement however is only accelerated by the temporary delay. We should correct the passing contrarieties of the day by observing the strong currents of universal history. The Eternal Spirit continues His work without haste and without rest. When we look back we see that there has never been a breach of continuity. Our Lord fulfilled, He did not annul the Law of His people. St Paul was the Apostle of Unity—even when he

appeared to be the author of disruption Our own troubles and controversies are the heralds of good things to come "There are many devices in man's heart, nevertheless the counsel of the Eternal, that shall stand "

PREPARING HIS WAY (d) BY DEVOTIONAL
SERVICE (*Personal Prayer*)

(1) By THE BISHOP OF RIPON
(RIGHT REV E A BURROUGHS, D D)

I

IN that strange work, *Man and Super man*, in which, nearly a quarter of a century ago, Mr George Bernard Shaw discussed a number of topics, then largely esoteric and even taboo, which have since emerged into unabashed publicity and become questions of widespread practical concern the Third Act, as some of you will remember, is partly laid in Hell, with the Devil and Don Juan as the principal characters

At first one supposes that Mr Shaw is merely out to be Shavian and shocking, so cynically are one's orthodox notions turned upside down In Hell, it seems, you can enjoy what the common man calls the good things of earth without even those drawbacks which attach to self indulgence here for you are no longer 'in the body' Heaven, on the other hand, is terribly dull, on the testimony of one who arrives to transfer his allegiance True, as the Devil admits, "it suits some people" but only the same sort of queer minority who prefer a classical concert to a football match Don Juan, however, is dissatisfied with Hell, though it is presented as a sort of sensualist's paradise, such as he of all people ought to have appreciated, and in the end makes known his intention of leaving for Heaven For apparently one can change over either way at will—though you won't want to stay if your mind is not right for your surroundings

The reason for this discontent is that he has caught a glimpse of the purpose of "the Life Force," as he calls it—the Power behind life which, blundering though its efforts be, is not (as he says) "so stupid as the forces of Death and Degeneration." It is labouring all the time, he tells us, to provide itself with an organ by which it can attain not only self consciousness but self understanding. Man is the culmination so far of its effort towards intelligency: and

"just as Life, after ages of struggle, evolved that wonderful bodily organ the eye, so it is evolving to-day a *mind's eye* that shall see, not the physical world but the purpose of Life, and thereby enable the individual to work for that purpose instead of thwarting and baffling it by setting up shortsighted personal aims as at present" (Act III, Sc iii, p 115)

The Devil defends his own dominions. "Here," he says to Don Juan, "you have all that you sought without anything that you shrank from." But Don Juan replies.

"On the contrary, here I have everything that disappointed me without anything that I have not already tried and found wanting. I tell you that as long as I can conceive something better than myself, I cannot be easy unless I am striving to bring it into existence or clear the way for it. That is the law of my life. It is the absence of this instinct in you that makes you that strange monster called a Devil. It is the success with which you have diverted men from their real purpose, which in one degree or another is the same as mine, that has earned you the name of The Tempter" (pp 129-30)

When the discussion reaches its climax, Juan sums up. "To be in hell is to drift, to be in heaven is to steer." "On the rocks most likely," retorts the Devil. "Pooh!" replies the other, "which ship goes oftenest on the rocks or to the bottom, the drifting ship or the ship with a pilot on board?"

The Devil still prefers to be "his own master and not the tool of any blundering universal force," and paints in on the other side what a Christian means by "the reproach of the Cross." If you serve his Life Force, he claims, "the end will be despair and decrepitude, broken nerve and shattered hopes, vain regret for . . . the waste and sacrifice of the power of enjoyment: in a word, the punishment of the fool who pursues the better before he has secured the good." "But at least I shall not be bored," cries the other, and closes the argument. "The service of the Life Force has that advantage, at all events." (p 134)

II.

ALL of which, of course, is a most incongruous beginning for a Church Congress paper on the subject of Prayer. And yet I think it just chimes in with the general idea that has been set before us—the Eternal Spirit and the preparation of His way. At least it gives an approach to a subject which to most seems trite, such that the ordinary outsider may just possibly be induced to use it, and so become a co-operator with the creative, personal Controller of what Shaw, in terms of the then prevailing vitalism, describes as a blundering "Life Force."

Not that even Shaw excludes the notion of a personal, intelligent control. It is very hard to get as far as vitalism without committing yourself to something more. What about "the ship with a pilot on board?" How can "self-understanding" in man be the goal of a process born of a Force which has no understanding of itself? And would not man, just in proportion as he grows in intelligence, grow "bored" with the service of a master-force which still remains unintelligent and "blind"? As

a matter of fact, in the quarter century since *Man and Super-man* was written, science itself has travelled far beyond that point. Much of the new biology already bids us think of "the universe as personality—that all-embracing Personality which we call God." (I am quoting Professor Haldane's little book, *Mechanism, Life and Personality*, and could go on quoting from other sources if time allowed). Anyhow the new biological way of thinking, to which the whole thought of our age is being turned, is one which offers a most helpful avenue into the Kingdom of the Spirit out of the materialistic desert which the science superseded by it created, if only the Church can translate the biological jargon into Christian terms. Nothing less radical will really help us. Merely to intensify the prayers of "the faithful," or even to get the non-praying majority of Churchpeople really to pray, is to leave the bulk of our problem still untouched. To save our age we must sooner or later persuade those multitudes to pray to whom Religion itself now seems to mean nothing. And that means making Religion a natural and no longer a far-fetched thing—a force interwoven with life itself—and Prayer a process deserving to be called "scientific" in the strictest sense—a process in harmony with all the facts, and without which the facts themselves must remain a discord.

It is here that the perspective of the sketch I have quoted comes (as I think) to our aid. "To be in hell is to drift"—along the unstable currents of impulse and circumstance, towards "short-sighted, personal aims," in attaining which we destroy one another without satisfying ourselves. "To be in heaven is to steer"—with a goal to make for and "a pilot on board." And the great differentiator between drifting and steering on the seas of the spirit is that practice—instinctive, universal,

persistent—which not Christians only but all humanity recognize as “Prayer” “If men would but believe,” cries George Macdonald “that they are in process of creation, and consent to be made!” And Prayer gives the consent which completes the belief It is the deliberate putting of the free but finite human spirit under the control of the infinite “creator Spirit” who stirs within—“working in you both will and deed in the interests of His own ideal” It means recognizing that achievement not in tune with that ideal must in the end mean futility if not actual disaster, and that the only progress for humanity—the race or the individual—is progress towards “the Christ that is to be,” the superhumanity of which the phenomena of Pentecost were the foretaste and which (according to the prophecy then quoted by St Peter), is meant to be coextensive with mankind ‘I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh yea, and upon My slaves, men and women, will I pour out of My Spirit’ This, and nothing less, is the goal of the Gospel of the Incarnation “He himself became man,” says Athanasius, strictest of orthodox theologians, “that we may be made God” and in Prayer we give our “consent to be made”—to be “conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren” It is the very central and most characteristic mode of ‘preparing His way’ the fundamental expression of that *aspiring dependence* which is faith, and which is the only “scientific” attitude for a being who is both the unfinished product of a great evolution and the kinsman of Him Who is at once its Source and its Goal

III

All the tasks of the Church to day come under one head—to provide on the human side the

conditions for a new age of faith, the characteristic product of which will be a new and "natural" practice of Prayer—that is, a practical recognition of the fact that "all things pass out into mystery," and that the heart of the mystery surrounding us is a Nature akin to, and seeking to complete, our own. "The universe as personality—that all embracing personality which we call God" It is only Natural Science coming round to the mystical world-view of St. Paul "in Him we live and move and have our being," with the corollary that He, too, "lives and moves" in us, and "has His being" in proportion as "the whole Body," united with Christ "the Head," "being kept supplied and compacted together by means of its joints and ligaments, increases the increase of God" (Col. ii, 20) And you get the same thought in an ultra modern French poet, Rene Arcos, though in terms which a strict theologian would wish to modify

"There is Someone in me who is stronger than me
There is Someone in me who is more true than me
Each man makes God a little—with his life "

Am I wrong in thinking that, along these lines, science and mysticism together are making possible an age of Prayer—an age in which praying will not be an occasional blundering adventure of "the average man," and the normal practice only of "the saint", but the natural reaction to reality of all whose view of reality is really modern? And, if such an age is a possibility—with all the evolutionary consequences that would follow from such widespread readjustment to God—is it not the one task of the Church to work to bring it in?

But if, as I have said, we cannot reach our goal without getting the multitudes back to Prayer, it remains true that the process must begin among

"the faithful," even though one may sometimes feel that it will be easier for God to swing the world round to the new perspective than to overcome the contented and ineffective orthodoxies of a large part of His Church. At any rate, whatever plans God may have for bringing the outside world to its knees, our duty, who seek to serve His Spirit, must be to revolutionize, if possible, the average Christian's theory and practice of Prayer

IV

In the time that is left to me I can only attempt rough jottings towards a plan of operations

In the first place, if Prayer is to be recognized as man's natural and characteristic reaction to reality as a whole—a reality now seen to be personal at the core, which is what the first article of our Creed asserts—it must cover the whole area of human life, and not function only in what we call the "moral" region. The familiar petition, "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit," must come to suggest, not a moral spring cleaning preparatory to a specialized religious experience, but a real inspiring and keying up of the whole complex personality such as to bring the manifestations of genius increasingly within its reach. The results should be seen, for instance, not merely in a new power to conquer "temptation" in the narrow sense, but in a new capacity for creation and kinship

Genius has been defined as "the innate or acquired power of feeling more sensitively with and for other people, of making wider, deeper, more vivid connections," and also as "the capacity to make a little go a long way." There is an obvious connection

between the sensibility of the artist and his creativeness, and a chief part of the miracle of creative art lies in the utter disproportion between the simplicity of the means and materials employed and the touch of "infinitude" felt in the results. The Christian is meant to be an all round artist in goodness, and to the "genius" he needs for his task the key is Prayer—an activity which begins as an appeal for the help of Another and passes into the self-expression of the Other in him. An Alsatian lady in a Swiss hotel once told me how, though not making any religious profession, she felt at times impelled to pray by the bedside of her little child. "And sometimes," she continued naively, "I pray so beautifully that I know it cannot be *I* who am praying." She had stumbled upon that deep truth about "the Spirit helping our infirmities" which St. Paul unfolds in Romans viii.

But my main point is that the "infirmities" for which *His* help is available are *all* the limitations of our many sided personality and the whole area of life is meant to be covered by our prayer. All of us who have really prayed know that Prayer does work by the way of "inspiration" in the widest sense. (*In my own experience, the outstanding instance of such inspiration was the gift of a quite impromptu and quite commonplace, but most successful, joke at the beginning of a very difficult speech*) Why then do we limit the Eternal Spirit by supposing that He is only interested in making us, in the narrow sense, "good"?

V

Secondly, and following from this, the prayer which is man's natural response to reality as seen "in God" will be, not negative and (so to speak)

conservative, so much as positive and creative. A great deal of current praying is warped, I think, by the spirit of "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings," as commonly misconstrued—and there is still a sting in the old description of the Church of England as "the Conservative Party at prayer." One does not pray merely, or chiefly, to be preserved from evil or kept where one is, but to get where one wants to be and to be brought up to one's highest power. "For this reason," says George Meredith, "so many fall from God after they have attained to Him, that they cling to Him with their weakness, not with their strength." "Salvation," the objective of religion, is really only the big and Christian way of spelling the much mis-handled word "success." Prayer remains, for all "the oppositions of science falsely so called," a way of getting things done—or rather, of getting the right things done in the right way—for it is only "if ye shall ask anything in My Name" that Our Lord assures us "I will do it." It is the instrument of man's co-operation in the creative evolution through which (in His own words again) "my Father worketh hitherto and I work", so that, in a world so imperfect and so fraught with evil, if it does not "create" or "revolutionize," one may question if it is the real thing. Creation, redemption, inspiration—the characteristic activities of the Three Persons in one God—these should also be characteristic of the life which is framed on Prayer. Are they not just the activities which most need to be developed among men to day?

VI

But, thirdly, and again in sequence, the prayer which is to be thus creative and transforming in its

results will be energetic, effort-ful in its nature nor will it grow easier as time goes on. *Orare* in this sense is indeed *laborare*. Coleridge, in a classic passage, describes the act of praying as "the very highest energy of which the human mind is capable," and even adds that "the great mass of worldly men and of learned men are absolutely incapable of prayer." It is not only that intellectual development, as such, involves no growth in spiritual faculty, while pre-occupation with material things is the surest way of keeping one's life down on a sub-human level. There is also the fact, too little recognized, that a life which is based on creative prayer will find its environment continually changing and expanding, and so be committed to daily readjustment to new light from Him Who says "Behold, I make all things new." If prayer is our reaction to reality, we shall have to react differently every day, as reality itself is transformed around us.

The satisfactions of "orthodoxy" are thus denied to him who really prays. "Orthodoxy," the claim to be finally right, represents what biology calls an "equilibrium position," the acceptance of which by an evolving organism spells deterioration and, ultimately, death. The highest in vision or conduct yet attained is, for the Christian, but the starting-point for things yet higher, and prayer is the ever lengthening ladder of his ascent. To the man of property or the man of settled ideas all this is anathema. His ambition, in religion as in life, is to feel that he has "got there," and to label himself "saved", whereas the act of tying on the label is itself a sign of falling from grace. One begins to see why our Lord chose poor men, and men without learning or theological prepossessions, for the first material of His Church. They at least were accustomed to work for their daily bread, and had

no prejudice against spiritual "moving on" They would, therefore, fit into the life of prayer as perpetual effort to keep up with God's revelation of His Will, and would understand why, if you are going to pray at all "Pray without ceasing" becomes the only possible rule—"in everything, by prayer and by petition, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known before God"

VII

But, for all the suggestion of tiresome spiritual energy in this view of Prayer, the paradox of the words that follow yet holds good "and the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall guard your hearts and thoughts in Christ Jesus" Nor is it an empty passive peace that comes, but a peace which is itself at once the result of vision—of dealing with reality and knowing where one is—and the pre-condition of seeing more In Don Juan's words, the servant of the Life Force is at least in no danger of being bored As that splendid sentence from *The Apology of Aristides* puts it 'Because they'—the Christians—"acknowledge the goodness of God towards them, therefore on account of them there flows forth the beauty that is in the world" And the best part of their privilege is to be not only seers themselves, but openers of the eyes of others "Where" cries Walt Whitman, 'is he who tears off the husks for you and me? Where is he that undoes stratagems and envelopes for you and me?' And is not the answer given in the words of Him who came to be 'the first born among many brethren,' the Second Adam through whom His own superhumanity was to multiply and replenish the earth? "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath

anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor, He hath sent Me to proclaim to the prisoners freedom and to the blind recovery of sight " "The universe is on the tiptoe of expectation waiting for the sons of God to appear"—men (and women) whose mere existence in a neighbourhood is a preparation of His Spirit's way because in them that Spirit lives and moves and makes things new

I or us others, who only "see afar" this "beautiful light," and "only sigh for" this "repose," the words of Emerson, I think, sum up the situation. If we meet no gods, it is because we harbour none. And if we want to reach the prayer of inspiration—which is itself the utterance of the Spirit in us, and makes us vehicles of the Spirit to others—we must only start out afresh from the prayer of duty, to which (it may be) we have to hold ourselves down by our bedside in the prosy light of a common dawn. The prayer of rejoicing is the reward of the prayer of rule and routine. But the rightness of the rule reveals itself in the way in which "the third heaven" at times invades the commonplace bedroom there and then as well as sending the needed succour later in the day. And the times of prayer which a soul approaches most reluctantly are often those which it is least willing to break off.

PREPARING HIS WAY: (d) BY DEVOTIONAL
SERVICE (*Public Worship*)

(ii) By Rev. R. G. PARSONS, D.D.,
*Rector of Birch, and Honorary Canon of
Manchester.*

THE title appointed for the Paper which I have been asked to read, considered in relation to that of the paper which has just been read, suggests two possible subjects for treatment. Either I ought to address myself mainly to a consideration of Public Worship as distinct from Private Prayer, or else I should deal with that activity of our devotional life, whether public or private, which finds expression in adoration rather than that which is concerned with petition. I propose to consider some matters concerning our Public Worship, rather than our private devotions, and more especially the element of adoration in our Public Worship, and thus I hope in some degree to to carry out the intentions of those who framed the programme of this Congress

But first, I will endeavour to make clear two theological pre-suppositions concerning the work of the Spirit of God, which will have a direct bearing on my treatment of the subject of Worship.

(1). The operation of the Eternal Spirit is not confined to what He does through Jesus Christ within the Christian Community. Before and since the Incarnation He has been and still is at work beyond as well as within the Church, all humanity, and indeed the whole created universe, is the sphere of His working. That this must be so, is a corollary in our belief concerning the Third Person of the Holy Trinity to our belief concerning the Second,

that the cosmic activity, creative and sustaining, of the Eternal Word of God has been in no way limited or suspended by His Incarnation. In every response from Created Existence to every stimulus from the Divine Logos through whom it has been created we discern the working of the indwelling Spirit, the *Anima mundi*, the cosmic life-giver, in His unceasing commerce with the ever active Word, deep calling to deep, light reflecting light. In the song of birds and the blossoming of flowers we may descry His inward power, as well as in the experience of mankind, and among men, not only in Palestine or in Christendom, but wherever humanity has sought to express through art, philosophy, or politics, as well as through religion, its answer to that immemorial call of the Perfect Being which is ever inciting the living universe to more abundant life.

(2) Yet the highest and most characteristic operation of the Spirit of God is that which He is doing within the sphere of Christianity as He reproduces Christ in Christians, sanctifying the People of God, so that they become the Tabernacle of God's fullest indwelling among men. It is with this supreme activity of the Spirit that the New Testament is exclusively concerned. The dispensation of the Spirit which has issued from the exaltation of the incarnate and crucified Son of God surpasses all the Spirit's other operations in significance and power, just as the saving work of the Incarnate Word eclipses even the splendour of His cosmic activities. When, as the outcome of the redemption wrought by the Son, the Spirit proceeding from the Father manifests His character as 'The Spirit of Jesus,' the climax of His glory has been revealed. Henceforth He is known to be above all else "The Holy Spirit," and this knowledge of His nature supplies us with the norm and standard with

reference to which we Christians must frame our interpretations of His more generally diffused activities

If then we would receive the Spirit's fullest inspiration in the ordering of the Church's worship, we must not ignore all that He has taught mankind in the regions of spiritual experience, discovery and achievement, beyond the strict confines of the Christian community but we must see to it that all these contributions are employed simply and solely to further the end for which Christian worship exists

Our common worship is or should be the deliberate conscious effort of the Christian Community to strengthen, deepen and purify its total living response to the God in whom we live and move and have our being in the light of that personal self revelation of His character and activity which He has vouchsafed to us in Jesus Christ, and in the inward power which issues from it, the power of the Holy Spirit Our worship is a means to an end, that end is a life lived in the Spirit of Christ by mankind as a whole, in time and in eternity Our worship is achieving its purpose in so far as it succeeds in inspiring mankind to consecrate all its manifold activities to the glory of God Its effects should be discerned not only in the personal piety of individuals, but in the ordering of families, villages cities, nations, and the world It should influence for good our work and our play, our science, philosophy, art, our industry and politics, no less than our religion It should shape our whole life, by supplying the saving grace of Sacrificial Consecration, by which alone man's manifold activities are rescued from futility and decay It should be the means whereby the triumphant Power of the Cross, which is the power of God's own self giving love, which is the Power of the Holy Spirit,

transfuses the whole complex of human existence

Such, I believe, is the ideal function of Christian worship within the Body of Christ, and in the world at large. Men should have recourse to it as to the necessary means whereby to keep in contact with the inspiration and power which alone can enable them to live the life that is life indeed, the life that is lived to God. It is because so much that passes for Public Worship no longer seems to have this dynamic influence in consecrating and enriching life that it is so widely neglected, simply because it is not worth while. Yet it is abundantly proved that where the Church is really trying to worship in spirit and in truth, instead of merely performing a series of traditional rites and ceremonies, then there is a response from the people of the sort that is valuable, not necessarily evidenced by vast crowds, but by the loyal devotion of men and women seeking to consecrate their whole lives to God.

As we look round on the various kinds of worship which are being practised in the Christian Church to day, we find that they can be roughly classified into two main groups, corresponding to the division which separates Protestant from Catholic Christianity, our own Anglican worship, as we should expect, occupying a position of somewhat unstable equilibrium between the two. Protestant forms of worship were moulded under the influence of an overmastering desire to escape from what had become an excessively elaborated system of rites and ceremonies, to what was believed to be the simplicity of the primitive Church. Protestants in the main have endeavoured to use only the methods employed by our Lord Himself in His earthly ministry, and by the first disciples under the immediate influence of His example. And because our Lord was not directly concerned with art or philosophy or science or

civilization, but with that which is the living heart of them all, Protestant worship has tended to concentrate itself simply and solely upon worship in the Spirit of Jesus as that Spirit is revealed in the records of the New Testament, it has tended to ignore the wider operations of the Spirit in life as a whole. In spite of the fact that it has for the most part broken free from set forms of ritual, it has proved itself to be far more static and conservative than the more Catholic types of worship. Edification has assumed more and more the central place among its objectives, not only in the preaching, but in the prayers and in the hymns. This has resulted in a certain subjectivity, individualism and man-centredness in a great deal of modern Protestant worship, awe, reverence, adoration are not its most conspicuous elements. There has been a noble insistence on the ethical elements inherent in all true Christianity, but a lowering of the sense of the holiness of beauty, and often an almost complete elimination of the sense of mystery and, in consequence of all this, many excellent people who know only the Protestant type of Public Worship feel that they can obtain for themselves most of its values by private reading and meditation, attendance at meetings for social reform, sacred concerts, or a wireless installation in their homes.

In marked contrast to this Catholicism has included in its cultus elements derived from many sources, believing that Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil, it has sought not to abolish but to baptize those methods which human experience all the world over has discovered to be effective in stirring and directing the imagination and the emotions of men in the mass. It has frankly appealed through all the senses to the heart of the worshipper. Magnificent buildings, pictures, images, music,

vestments, incense, lights, employed as setting and adjuncts to a solemn dramatic action, symbolic in all its details—if these had proved effective in impressing Jews and heathen with the imperfect truths and errors of their religion, why should they not be employed to better effect to bring home to Christian worshippers the perfect truths of theirs? And so there came to be included in the great system of Catholic worship elements derived not only from Judaism, but from the mystery religions and from the Court ceremonial of the Byzantine Cæsars. This type of worship from its very nature tends to produce a too luxuriant growth of symbol and ceremony, which threatens to obscure and suffocate the *Evangelical truths which it is intended to convey*. Formalism, externalism, superstition, are its constant dangers, and the spirit of adoration which it undoubtedly fosters may all too easily become either mere æsthetic enjoyment, or degenerate into an almost unethic awe in the presence of mystery, when it does not cross the border line between religion and magic, and seek to manipulate the sacred for the advantage of the devotee.

Clearly there is much to be said both for and against these now contrasted types of Christian worship. It is difficult, and perhaps not very profitable, to appraise exactly their efficiency in fulfilling the ultimate purpose of worship. It is more to the point to realize that each developed in isolation from the other threatens grave danger to religion. For us of the English Church at the present time the most interesting and obvious fact is that a very remarkable revival of the Catholic type of cultus is developing among us. It is not confined to the Anglo-Catholic Party, nor even to Anglicans. There is the Free Catholic movement among Free Churchmen, and there are analogous

movements in German Protestantism, which are of great interest to ourselves. And the reason for this very powerful trend in the development of modern Christian worship is not simply a higher æsthetic standard than that of our fathers of the four past centuries, nor a more accurate knowledge of what the worship of the early Church was really like. It is, I believe, due to the determination of the religious consciousness to find satisfaction for a vital element in all religion, which modern Protestantism is in danger of ignoring. What that vital element is has been nowhere more brilliantly described than in Professor Otto's famous book *Das Heilige*, translated into English with the title *The Idea of the Holy*. Time forbids that I should attempt any analysis or criticism of this most valuable, but also most dangerous, book. But however much Dr Otto's work may be misunderstood and misused in the interests of obscurantism, superstition and vulgar mystery mongering, we must be lastingly grateful to him for having concentrated our attention on what is from its crudest beginnings right through to its sublimest achievements the distinguishing characteristic of man's religious consciousness, namely, the contact with that element in our experience which evokes in us the response of awe. That which produces awe is what Otto means by "The Holy", and when he enquires into the characteristics of that which produces awe, he defines it by the Latin phrase *Mysterium tremendum et fascinans*. Man finds himself in the presence of a mystery, which affects him at once with fear and fascination, he cannot escape, even if he would. "whither shall I go then from Thy spirit? or whither shall I go then from Thy presence? If I climb up into heaven, Thou art there if I go down into hell, Thou art there also."

The progress of knowledge and civilization does

not eliminate the experience of awe, but refines and sublimates it. That which evokes it in the sensitive and highly developed consciousness of a really civilized man or woman, is contact with a manifestation of that which he recognizes as having absolute value, be it beauty, truth or goodness. Awesomeness is the halo or "Aura" which emanates from the Absolute, our sense of awe, in its higher forms, as distinguished from the mere shudders and fears of cruder religion, is our response to the presence of a Being, other than ourselves, in whom we are aware of mysterious perfections which we can but imperfectly grasp or express. It is the characteristic feeling evoked by concentration on the being and presence of God as He is in His eternal and changeless reality, that transcendent Object of our profoundest emotions of wonder, admiration and love. Such awe is indeed "the best of man", it is the absence of it from so much of our public worship which deprives it of uplifting, strengthening power and leaves it with little but a utilitarian value, which can perhaps be equally well provided by other means. In so far as the revival of Catholic methods of worship is an insistence on the givenness and the objectivity of the Divine mystery and presence, and aims at arousing in the worshippers the sense of holy awe and its consequence the practice of selfless adoration, simply giving thanks to God for His great glory, manifested in its holiest and most awe-inspiring perfection in the self sacrifice of God the Son then I for one can only wish to see it spread far and wide. For the history of religion since the Reformation affords us ample warning that to ignore or undervalue what Otto calls the 'numinous' element in religion tends inevitably to depotentiate it and reduce it to something which is not religion either to a morality, which for lack of religious content

becomes immorally utilitarian, or to sterile speculation on insoluble enigmas, or to neurotic emotionalism, and the sense of mystery, failing to find its true expression in adoration, seeks satisfaction in less desirable directions, such as those offered by spiritualism, theosophy and the like

Yet the break up of Mediæval Catholic Worship remains a warning to Christendom for all time, that the soul of man revolts from any system of cultus which presents it with the Divine mystery under forms which no longer satisfy the enlightened conscience or reason of the worshippers. The Mediæval Mass was undoubtedly beautiful and impressive, but it ceased to influence a large proportion of the strongest personalities of those days, because it had become divorced from the ethics and the best learning of the period

But the need of the Church and of the world to day is a revival of the sense of awe, of reverence, and adoration. What is required of many modern places of worship is that they should become places of worship. Christianity is in danger of becoming man-centred rather than God-centred, the Second Commandment is usurping the place of the First. A reign of universal humanitarian benevolence would not be the Kingdom of God. Mankind cannot find its satisfaction in mankind alone. Worship in Spirit and in truth of that which transcends mankind, that Being, "wholly other" from us men, yet mysteriously akin, in the awful perfection of His energies and in the holliness of His Self-giving love, is the fundamental need of the Spirit of man. The world is sick for lack of Adoration, it has lost the vision of that which it can and must adore. It is for the Church to re-awaken the sense of the mystery of existence, and of its sanctity, the sanctity of love, and sacrifice and forgiveness, the

sanctity of the search for truth and of truth discovered; the sanctity of right for right's own sake; the sanctity of beauty in all its forms. Much of our present civilization is a blatant blasphemy against these sanctities; and in a democratic age there is a danger lest the Church should be too faithful a mirror of the weakness of the period. But its worship is to remind mankind that God does not exist for our benefit, but we for His Service who alone is worthy to receive glory and honour and power, for He has created all things; and because of His will, they were and were created.

IV

THE SPIRIT AND EVANGELISM

(1) By REV C E RAVEN, D D ,
Canon Residentiary of Liverpool

It is with a sense of the uttermost thankfulness, I am sure, that you are met in this hall this evening at the closing meeting of our Congress week, thankfulness for what this Congress may mean to the Church of God in its evangelistic work. We have been groping for nearly a generation now, groping after a conception which we realized was embedded deep in the teaching and example of our Master as modern studies were beginning to recover for us a fuller knowledge of His history, a conception which plainly would give us points of contact with the best aspirations of art and science and moral endeavour, a conception to which, here and there, isolated prophets were pointing us. But I believe in this Congress God has given us that for which we hoped and prayed when the subject was put forward and the speakers discussed and the headings allocated. He has given us, I believe, a consistent, manifold and profound evangelistic message, for evangelism is just simply the showing out to the world of the riches of Christ Jesus, the holding up before men of that figure of whom it is still true to say that if He be lifted up He will draw all men unto Him. Evangelism must needs have point of contact, as you, my Lord, have said, with all sorts and conditions at home and abroad, as Christ, the master evangelist, Himself had, and surely He has shown us this week a presentation of His Eternal Spirit compiled for us here by the work of many minds from many points of view but yet

singularly uniform, compelling, attractive, austere and yet human. Don't let us be led astray into comparisons between what is called the old evangelism and the new evangelism, the old Gospel and the new Gospel. It is easy, I know, and many of us, I speak in penitence, very many of us have been so filled with the wonder of the new that we have been blind to the values of the old, and have spoken without charity or sympathy of that which in our pride we thought we had outgrown. Surely we shall see the truth more fully if we recognize that the change which to some of you has made this Congress seem almost revolutionary is a testimony to the stature of the Lord, to our infinite inability to grasp the grandeur of Jesus Christ complete. I have been reading during the last twelve months some dozen recent attempts to describe the character of Jesus. Everyone of these attempts, ranging over human beings, their authors, as diverse as you could find, everyone of these attempts was an accurate portrait of its author's ideal, everyone of them was inadequate, plainly and obviously and manifestly inadequate to do justice to the great figure of the Lord, and if that is true of individual writers it is true surely of the varying developing generations of Christian people. Fifty years ago the evangelist saw the Lord in terms of the Saviour from an eternity of damnation. He saw a tremendous picture of divine justice and redemptive love, and to him that picture stood framed as the full likeness of the Man of Nazareth. Jesus cannot be framed. He breaks every frame that human beings have tried to place Him in. He stands too big for any of us to measure the fulness of His stature. And if we in our day see other aspects of the wonder of His majesty we must just tell as faithfully as we can what we see in Him, not venturing to suppose that we have the whole truth or to condemn

those who see other sides, but trying in all humility and in all sincerity to rise to such a point of consecration that His Spirit may be able to show us something of the Eternal truth there revealed. What, then, is the kind of evangelism, the kind of message, which goes out from a Congress like this? Quite plainly central to it, as central to so much of our present day understanding of our religion, quite plainly central to it is the thought of the world wide sovereignty of God, His Kingdom. That stands out from whatever point of view you approach it among Christians of all denominations as the new emphasis, the newly discovered emphasis, which colours for our generation our whole thinking about the Master. But to interpret that Kingdom we can, I think, learn a great deal from what this Congress has contributed to the thinking of the Church. The Kingdom of God we are not to interpret are we, in terms of a new and reformed social order? Some people, even, my Lord, some of your colleagues on the Bench have suggested that those of us who are connected with the Copec movement identify the Kingdom of God with the Kingdom of Garden Cities. That is wholly and utterly untrue for us all though we are perfectly clear in maintaining continually that the thought of the Kingdom of God must and will profoundly modify the whole structure and order of human society. Nor shall we think of the Kingdom of God as an authority, an external authority imposed, imperial fashion, upon those who are somewhat unwillingly its subjects. It will include I suppose what is called theocracy, but that theocracy will be utterly different in temper and circumstance from all the empires of the ages. Nor will it be what there is sometimes a danger of its becoming—an ecclesiastical domination. We shall not bring in the Kingdom of God by magnifying the

supernatural at the cost of divorcing it from the natural, by appealing, as some students of Otto would appeal, to the *Mysterium tremendum*, and making of it an object of superstition. There will be wonder and awe and a great inrush into us of the sense of the supernatural, but it will be the taking up of the natural into the supernatural and not the divorce of the one from the other. This Congress surely has helped us to see that the Kingdom of God is to be interpreted for us in terms of that Eternal Spirit of whose presence and working we have been thinking during this week in terms, I think, of the great conceptions formulated by the fourth Evangelist who for us surely is a true commentator, a true exegete of the Synoptic records. We shall stress that eternal relationship, that eternal life which came through Jesus Christ and consists in the knowledge of God and shall show how by that emergent Deity, as Professor Alexander calls it, men are fused and welded together into an incorporate fellowship, so that the Christ's Spirit, verily and indeed, becomes incarnate again. Surely so we are interpreting the Kingdom of God on the lines which our thinking this week has laid down and which Holy Scripture endorses and which experience of evangelistic work proves is of power in these days.

I want to stress three sides of that presentation of our Gospel, three elements in it which have appeared right through the course of this week's meetings and which will, I believe, give to the evangelism of to day the same, if not a greater authentic and compelling validity, as that of past generations. What is it that stands out as our message, the message which we of this day and time are commissioned to go and carry to all the nations? Well, first of all, surely, we must put as the whole trend of recent religious thought bids us put, the

communion with the Eternal, that which the mystics know as the union with God, that which poets and artists, seers and sages, crusaders and heroes feel when, in a blaze of creative wonder, there is given to them a sudden and overwhelming conviction of God, when there sweeps into them an experience which they can then interpret into terms of beauty and truth and goodness, which they express through their art, or through their science, or through their moral endeavour, but which is itself a grander thing than any of those values, as I believe it is both their source and their fulfilment. That inspiration of the Holy Spirit, as we in this hall should call it, that, I think you will find, has come with singular unanimity to be acclaimed by all the prophets of our day, artists, scientists, theologians alike, as man's supreme achievement, the highest level in that ladder of emergent, new emergent qualities, which we can trace from the very simplest to the most sublime, which gives a unity and coherence to all our thinking about the universe. You will say "That is a very mysterious thing. People can understand the Cross of Christ and His redeeming blood. They won't understand all this mystic talk about a sense of the Eternal." Won't they? Christ did not think so, did He? He took a handful of the very simplest Galilean peasant people and said to them 'If you have eyes to see you can see. God is blazing out upon you in all the simplest things of every day, the sower in the field, the woman sweeping the house, the fishermen sitting round their nets, everywhere the earth is full of the glory of the Lord. Lift up your eyes and see. There it is, in front of you.' And they saw. And I believe you will find universally, indeed this Congress has profoundly convinced me of the truth of that belief, that wherever you get human aspiration, there lies embedded in it

a sense of the divine, a sense of union with a life larger than our own, a control by a purpose which we can but dimly apprehend, a sense of security and peace and yet of compulsion and glad constraint as God breaks through upon the soul. Now the fact that this communion with the Eternal is the very core of religious experience and, I believe, the very kernel of our Lord's meaning when He spoke of the Kingdom of God, the very fact that it is communion with the Eternal means that we shall have to interpret it perhaps in a very vast variety of ways, in the medium which is native to us. We cannot shut up the Eternal within a formula. We cannot draw a picture of the Eternal. We cannot even in music, though perhaps there we get nearest to the heart of it, we cannot even there have a full interpretation of Him. Our Congress has shown us that in all honest human activity, in all the manifold ways in which men seek beauty and truth and goodness, there is, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, a conveying, a transmitting of the Eternal, an expression of that which, in itself, exceeds complete definition. What I am pleading for is this: that in our evangelism we ought to be very gentle indeed in condemning those who fulfil their functions as evangelists and help men to see God by media which we cannot ourselves use; that we ought to be extraordinarily quick to realize that God reveals Himself to different people through very different forms; that they have a technique of their own by which to make Him known, some one range of qualities and means which to them interprets the sacred; and that provided they, in utter sincerity and real humility, strive to present the beauty and truth and goodness that they can understand, we ought to be enormously slow to condemn. Of course, quite plainly there are certain forms and

modes, certain forms of doctrine and worship, certain modes in art and science, which will commend themselves to the best thought of the generation as the worthiest representatives of God. To that kind of authority we ought all to be ready to pay the most rapt attention. But one would sooner have, however feeble it might be, the genuine effort of a sincere and humble spirit to help others to see God than the most magnificent achievement of orthodoxy if it was borrowed at second hand. It is truth, it is sincerity that counts, sincerity in your evangelist. Second hand repetition of familiar formulæ never did anyone any good in the world. It may produce at its best a sort of hypnosis, a nice, comfortable feeling but unless you are prepared to give yourselves away, unless you are so possessed by the thing you see that you have made it your own, you cannot hope that others will receive from you what you desire to give because, in fact, you have not got it to give. There must be enormously wide tolerance for those who are sincere. That, I am afraid, will not commend itself to those who see the evident need for authority and the evident power of uniformity. I cannot help it. To me in this extraordinarily difficult time when we are groping through to a conception of God so much vaster than we have known, it seems better to run the risk of erratic and misunderstood and incomplete presentations of Him than to try and drill and dragoon men into anything like agreed results, only we must be sincere and see God. That is the first note I want to make. I want to stress as a mark of evangelism, that it will put the real communion with God, the emergence of the Eternal Spirit, the mystic knowledge which is Eternal life, right in the centre of its message.

Obviously that may lead, as I have said already,

to a kind of individualism, to a sort of anarchy which may produce something much more like Babel than Pentecost. Therefore in the second place, we must bear in mind that such a union with the Eternal does not reach its fulness and is not worthy to be called membership in the Kingdom of God, unless it is accompanied by a vivid and intimate experience of fellowship. There I want to stress a matter which I think this Congress has rather left aside. I believe with all my heart that the great task for students at this time, for students of evangelism, for students of Christianity, is to explore, and, if God gives us grace, to discover the real power and vitality of the life of fellowship, of what some call the group mind, of that corporate and unifying spirit which gripped the original body of believers and sent them out of one heart and one mind, that which St. Paul ventured to assume as inherent in the Church when he called the Church the Body of Christ. We have known, some of us, even in ordinary secular life, we have known groups of individuals so welded together by common devotion to a great ideal and by intimate sympathy one with another—and those two things are I think, the essential conditions—that they behave like a single person. I saw it in my battalion on the eve of action in the war. There was a common spirit animating them all, restraining the arrogant, holding up the weak, a spirit so strong that cowards like myself could lean back upon it and renew their strength, a spirit so pervading that men played up to one another unconsciously but inevitably at its bidding. You will see the same thing in a trained and sound team of people fulfilling a common purpose. You will see it more fully where the source of their inspiration is high and adequate to satisfy, you will see it supremely in those manifestations of the Spirit of

God in fellowship which even in these days¹ recall something of the wonder of Pentecost. You have known, please God you have known, what it is to be held up by the fellowship of those who share with you a common experience and a common faith, to feel that you are never alone, to have your thoughts enriched, even suggested, by their prayers, to be so certain of the power of prayer that you can utterly and sincerely rely upon what they are making possible for you, upon the resources which the prayer of the fellowship pours in to aid your weakness and restrain your egoism. We have great discoveries to make there, all of us. But let us put into the front of our message alongside of our good news of Eternal Life in God, this—that we, His children, are already members in the great fellowship of His family, that we are admitted into the homelife of His children, and that we are native to the Garden of the Lord. That all sounds like mere poetry. Put it this way. It came to me as an amazing discovery. For years and years in my life I had felt something of what a Christian means by his discipleship. I had tried to tell others the good news of the Kingdom of God. But all the time I had been aware that I was, as it were, standing outside the door of the King's Palace. Sometimes great and generous spirits opened the door and showed me what there was inside so that I could try to tell others of it, and sometimes they even beckoned to me to come in. But I was afraid, for I knew I was really living in the world and not in the family of God. And then suddenly through a discovery of the power of fellowship, through the discovery that I was verily at one with the Church, the group of my fellow believers, I was inside, quite certainly inside, a child of the House. Many of you, most of you, please God, with your finer and richer discipleship have come through that experience.

to a kind of individualism, to a sort of anarchy which may produce something much more like Babel than Pentecost. Therefore in the second place, we must bear in mind that such a union with the Eternal does not reach its fulness and is not worthy to be called *membership in the Kingdom of God*, unless it is accompanied by a vivid and intimate experience of fellowship. There I want to stress a matter which I think this Congress has rather left aside. I believe with all my heart that the great task for students at this time, for students of evangelism, for students of Christianity, is to explore, and, if God gives us grace, to discover the real power and vitality of the life of fellowship, of what some call the group mind, of that corporate and unifying spirit which gripped the original body of believers and sent them out of one heart and one mind, that which St. Paul ventured to assume as inherent in the Church when he called the Church the Body of Christ. We have known, some of us, even in ordinary secular life, we have known groups of individuals so welded together by common devotion to a great ideal and by intimate sympathy one with another—and those two things are, I think, the essential conditions—that they behave like a single person. I saw it in my battalion on the eve of action in the war. There was a common spirit animating them all, restraining the arrogant, holding up the weak, a spirit so strong that cowards like myself could lean back upon it and renew their strength, a spirit so pervading that men played up to one another unconsciously but inevitably at its bidding. You will see the same thing in a trained and sound team of people fulfilling a common purpose, you will see it more fully where the source of their inspiration is high and adequate to satisfy, you will see it supremely in those manifestations of the Spirit of

God in fellowship which even in these days¹ recall something of the wonder of Pentecost. You have known, please God you have known, what it is to be held up by the fellowship of those who share with you a common experience and a common faith, to feel that you are never alone, to have your thoughts enriched, even suggested, by their prayers, to be so certain of the power of prayer that you can utterly and sincerely rely upon what they are making possible for you, upon the resources which the prayer of the fellowship pours in to aid your weakness and restrain your egoism. We have great discoveries to make there, all of us. But let us put into the front of our message alongside of our good news of Eternal Life in God, this—that we, His children, are already members in the great fellowship of His family, that we are admitted into the homelife of His children, and that we are native to the Garden of the Lord. That all sounds like mere poetry. Put it this way. It came to me as an amazing discovery. For years and years in my life I had felt something of what a Christian means by his discipleship. I had tried to tell others the good news of the Kingdom of God. But all the time I had been aware that I was, as it were, standing outside the door of the King's Palace. Sometimes great and generous spirits opened the door and showed me what there was inside so that I could try to tell others of it, and sometimes they even beckoned to me to come in. But I was afraid, for I knew I was really living in the world and not in the family of God. And then suddenly through a discovery of the power of fellowship, through the discovery that I was verily at one with the Church, the group of my fellow believers, I was inside, quite certainly inside, a child of the House. Many of you, most of you, please God, with your finer and richer discipleship have come through that experience.

To me it is a necessary complement to what we call conversion, to the emerging in me of union with God, to go on to discover that I and all of us are within the family. It changes the outlook of men and women profoundly when they become convinced, not as a matter of pious words and aspirations but as a fact as plain as earthly kinship, that they are within the House of God, that they are native to His Kingdom.

My third and last point is this. Can we get back into our evangelism that note of urgency which was so characteristic of the message of the Lord, and has been a necessary, an inevitable part in any real preaching of the Gospel since? Surely the Congress has answered that doubt, if it was a doubt. Surely it has shown to us beyond any question at all that we do not need to rely on the motive of fear in order to get a sense of the magnitude and importance of the message with which we are charged. Surely the vision which we have seen of the operation of God moving right through the whole vast process of creation to its culmination in that redemptive fulness which shall be hereafter, surely that, with its sense of the immense significance of the Christian fellowship as the heir of an infinite myriad of generations, as bought by the blood of all the lives that have been poured out that man might come, all the lives that have been poured out that Christ might come, all the lives that have been poured out that we might continue our discipleship to His Spirit, bought in a word by His blood in which all other sacrifice is taken up and made complete, surely that kind of message transcending enormously our imagination thrilling us with the wonder of all the beauty of the world which is in it, satisfying our craving to know and understand ought to inspire us with a tremendous urge of energy and aspiration to be worthy of our calling, ought to

give us a sense of immediate need, ought to possess us with a vision of God so holy that we cry "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel," that we find ourselves led under a strong constraint not only to bring our lives into harmony with the vision of the Eternal Spirit whom we have seen, but to offer ourselves in all humility His servants, His messengers, His evangelists, to walk the way of the Cross, to fill up in ourselves that which is lacking in the redemptive suffering of the Lord.

.

THE SPIRIT AND EVANGELISM

(ii) By THE REV. CANON GARFIELD H WILLIAMS,
, ' MB, OBE,

*Secretary of the Missionary Council of the
Church Assembly.*

IN his opening address, our President asked us to think out afresh that mode of the Divine activity which we describe as the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and minds of men, to discover the signs and to contemplate boldly yet humbly the fact of His presence there, to study the conditions He demands in order that His indwellings may have a full and free effect, and to discover how we may assist in so far as it lies within our power to produce these conditions

The classical illustration of Divine preparation for theophany is, I suppose, afforded by that period of history that St. Paul described as ' the fullness of the times ' Imperial Rome dominated the whole Mediterranean world and beyond to North and South All was linked up by Empire wide communications, and travel and commerce were safe as never before in history

The break up of Greece had already begun to leaven the whole of the Roman world with a mental force that was to permeate every part of it and which was going to prove itself the abiding source of an inspiration which was " not for an age, but for all time " The Jewish dispersion had commenced and was growing rapidly along the avenues that the Roman power had made safe and easy, and so God's revelation of Himself in and through the Jewish nation

was becoming available for all the Roman world. It was a world that had become enriched by the gifts of Greek language and thought, Roman law and order, Jewish ethics and monotheism, and Oriental mysticism, and which had developed a network of communications and a vast commercial and administrative system to facilitate their interplay. And then the Messiah came, God incarnate, God revealing Himself in a human life, lived at a tremendous moment in history at the very point where the meshes of that whole network of rapidly developing life were most intertwined. Every one of us, I suppose, has formed in his mind some picture of Christ which is for him characteristic. I see the Man of Nazareth on the hills of Galilee of the Gentiles, overlooking the great Roman road in the plain of Esdraelon, joining East and West, and with His gaze directed across the plain to the hills beyond where, hidden from His sight but not from His imagination, is the Holy City—a Zion that has become an outpost of the Roman Empire and outside the gates of which is a little hill called Calvary, where presently Romans and Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians, simple village folk and the riff raff of a great city, will compass His death.

God, you say, was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. Yes, but it would be just as true to say, would it not, that God was in the world preparing the world for His Christ.

Further illustrations of the same movement of God in history are not far to seek. The Old Testament is a sacred book for us because it is a record of just such movements in history before the Christ came to dwell amongst us, and when the Christ is crucified, risen and ascended, and there comes into existence that community on earth which is henceforth to be His body, all history then becomes a

setting for the working out of the destiny of that Church. There is the little band of the followers of "the way." They comprehend so little of that destiny, see so dimly the goal for which they strive, understand so little of the task in hand. This only they know, that from the Christ who was all in all to them, and from the Father God, whom He revealed, there proceeds that Holy Spirit of whose presence they are conscious and of whose power they have daily experience. Is this little band inspired by His Spirit just the sport of circumstances or is that Spirit that they feel within them manifesting His activities as well in the world outside them? Persecution drives them from Jerusalem and that very persecution provides for them their leader. Have not Tarsus and the school of Gamaliel and the martyrdom of St. Stephen and the road to Damascus each of them a place in the Divine plan for Saul, the Pharisee, and the Roman citizen? You cannot limit God's dealings with Saul of Tarsus to a moment of theophany on the Damascus road. And so it is all down history and so it is to day. We do not look for the operations of the Spirit simply in the preaching of the good news. Just as much we look for the operations of the Spirit where that Spirit intends that the good news shall be in some special way proclaimed, and often indeed it is just this recognition of the presence and operation of the Spirit in some particular connection which constitutes God's call to His Church to venture forth, and in the power of that Spirit to enter new fields and undertake new tasks.

For this reason the Church must always have a vision which ranges over the whole world, for she must be on the look out for such manifestations of the Spirit as may constitute for her some fresh call of God. Was it something of this sort that our Master meant when, to His disciples, He said 'look

round, I tell you, the fields are white under harvest," and was not this harvest of which He spoke essentially of the same order of things as the Kingdom of Heaven, concerning which He said to Nicodemus, unless a man be born again, he cannot see it? And is not that just the reason why, if the manifestations of the Spirit in the course of history and in the world of our day are to be recognized, it will be the redeemed of God who gain the vision? Is it fair to expect the world to see and to understand the spiritual realities which underlie the movements that are taking place all over the world to day? Is it not one of the primary duties of the members of the body of Christ to look around them and to pray that God the Holy Ghost may help them to see and to understand the indications of His work in the lives of men and nations? We believe that there are to day throughout the world indications of the operation of that Holy Spirit, such as have seldom before been presented in history, that we are indeed living at a period which can only rightly be described as a "fulness of the times." I do not think that we have any right to attempt to forecast just what it is to which God is leading us. All we have got to do is to be obedient to the heavenly vision and to undertake the next step when it is made clear to us what that next step is. But there is no hope of seeing the operations of the Spirit unless we look for them and no chance of hearing His call to action unless we deliberately listen for His voice. So just for a moment let us try to look at the world and see it as best we can as we believe God sees it, and let us ask ourselves whether in that world of to day, there is anything which clearly indicates to us some fresh manifestation of the Divine Spirit.

The first thing to note is that for the first time in history it is possible to look at the world and in some real way to recognize its potentialities. That in

itself is something which ought to lead all of us furiously to think. We cannot believe that our modern world-consciousness is something that has no relationship to the divine purpose. When we ask ourselves how this new capacity for what I have called world consciousness has arisen, we are startled to find that it has its origin in what are apparently the ordinary processes of human development. In describing these processes one would have to take note of such things as the agricultural and industrial revolutions in modern times, the scientific achievement of our modern age, the development of the education of masses of ordinary people in the western world, the economic dependence of one nation upon another owing both to the growth of population and a development of the standard of living. We should find that the whole process of world consciousness was very intimately related to commercial and industrial development and should even have to take into consideration the constructive elements in so ghastly a thing as human warfare. It is difficult at first sight to imagine that behind all this God is somehow working out some vast purpose and yet it surely must be so, and if so, it is something to which we must give our most careful consideration. Some of us look upon David Livingstone as the greatest Christian of the last century. There has been however, a tendency for people to think chiefly of the heroic side of that great man's personality rather than of its prophetic side. If ever there was a simple religious soul with an almost primitive religious faith, it was David Livingstone, and yet when he went out to Africa he did not spend his life preaching the simple Gospel and building up a little indigenous native church in faith and character. Rather did he spend his time in opening out as far as he could the whole of Africa, so that contacts could be made

- between the peoples of Africa and all the forces of western civilization. We know well from his life that he did not underestimate the dangers of those contacts, but realizing those dangers to the full, he was prepared to take the risk. It was the risk that the surgeon takes when, conscious of the presence of some deep seated suppuration, he cuts right down upon it and opens it all up in the conviction that its causes cannot be dealt with until there is freedom of access and egress. The surgeon well knows the dangers of the actual operation and the fact that further infection from without is possible unless very drastic precautions are taken, but he takes the risk, because he knows it is the only hope. And so did Livingstone. That same risk is something which is all the time being taken by God Himself, and seems to be the kind of risk which in some entirely fresh and more complete way, God is taking in the world of this particular age in which we live. It appears that in some fresh and infinitely larger way than ever before in history, God is using the ordinary workings of men's minds and the achievements of their thinking for the opening up of the whole world. It seems that in some new way he is Harnessing the tremendous economic factors of the world's life for the development of some divine plan, that He is using our western commerce and our western industry and our western organizing capacity and administrative ability for the furtherance of His divine purposes throughout the world. He is breaking in upon the whole world with all the new forces which He is permitting to enter it from this great power house of western civilization. Do we sufficiently think of the Holy Spirit as operating in the realm of commerce and industry and controlling the development of our modern economic system for God's own purposes? How it would change our whole attitude to the work

of our every-day lives if we realized that the *preparatio evangelica* included the work of the ordinary business man; necessitated the hard physical labour of the miner and the cotton spinner and the agricultural labourer; was being undertaken in office and in shop and in factory, was the supremely important thing in the work that was being undertaken in every laboratory and class room and studio, and provided the background for our administrative and judicial system! What a difference it would make to the ordinary humdrum routine toil of the lowliest worker if he could really feel that his work had some intimate relationship to the vast purposes of God and that it all had its place in some tremendous divine plan that was working itself out in the history of our day! But is not this actually the fact? As, in this present age, we have broken down the boundaries that have separated nation from nation, cutting our way through the jungles and the forests and the deserts, building our railways and our roads, conquering the sea and the air, making all the apparatus of our western civilization available for the whole world, are any of us in any branch of the world's activities being left out of this huge scheme of things? Indeed if a man in his work becomes once convinced that he has no part in that huge scheme of things, must he not at once throw up the work that he is doing and discover some other in which he can feel that he is taking his share in the world's true life? I ask this Congress to consider whether we Churchmen have not in the past had far too narrow a conception of the work of the Holy Spirit in evangelism. Have we taken any trouble to make the ordinary worker in the ordinary every-day developments of the world's life realize that his work, if done in the right spirit, may actually become a factor in the world's regeneration, since it has its

part in some tremendous divine purpose for the opening up of the whole world?

But there is another aspect of this matter to which I must call your attention. There is, as you all know, taking place in Africa and the East to-day a birth or rebirth of nations which is on a scale and progressing with a rapidity never before seen in history. We are seeing, in what for history is but a moment of time, the birth of African nationality out of a welter of primitive tribes. We are witnessing the beginnings of a disintegration of the Mohammedan world which for us Christians has no meaning unless it means a preparation for some larger life of those many millions of splendid human material who at present are followers of the great Prophet of Arabia. We are witnesses of that amazing and intensely moving process of renaissance that is taking place in India, watching one of the proudest peoples in the world, conscious of a history and traditions as great, or greater than that possessed by any other people, coming into contact with all the thought and aspiration and activity of the western world and striving slowly and painfully for some synthesis which shall comprise all that is best in their own great past as well as all that is good in the multitudinous life of the western world. We are distant spectators of movements in the Far East staggering in their possibilities for good or evil. The contact of East with West in China shows few results at present except such as are related to disintegration and destruction. Much is being pulled down, little as yet is being built up, but nobody doubts but that the constructive elements will soon emerge. What does all this mean, unless we can think of it in terms of the operation of the Holy Spirit? What, surely, is taking place in Africa and the East to-day, is essentially a vast movement in the minds and hearts

of men, some tremendous urge which they cannot explain and which they cannot prevent, driving them all towards a goal they do not see, along avenues they have never before traversed. And as we look out upon the world to-day, is it not becoming more and more obvious that the only possible way of controlling and guiding all these terrific forces that are being let loose in the world is by some fresh liberation by the Church of the forces of the Holy Spirit? You can only control one enthusiasm by another and greater enthusiasm. You can only guide and control a movement operating in the minds and hearts of men by a movement of the Spirit of God. But what does it all mean, if it does not suggest deep calling unto deep? The Holy Spirit of God working through all the interminable activities of our western civilization to break up the fallow ground of the African's mind, to irrigate the parched lands of India's thought to make possible the fruition of all that is best and greatest in China's past, and in that work calling to the Church of Christ, here in the Western World, to liberate those spiritual forces which are resident within her and might be operative for the building up of the Kingdom of God in Africa and the East? Surely it is God the Holy Spirit by the very operation of that spirit in the thought and work and life of a reborn world calling to the Church to occupy that world for Christ.

One other point if God is showing us that it is possible for us, in and through His Spirit, to relate all the ordinary activities of our every day life to his vast purpose for the world, and if God, by the tremendous operations of that spirit throughout the world, is calling His Church to some fresh endeavour, by prayer and sacrifice to liberate the forces of the Spirit that are resident within her for the healing of the nations and the building up of all the world, does it

not necessarily follow that as we take our share in the task of baptizing unto Christ this new world-wide civilization, and as each of us individually does our part in striving to make this whole world order more Christian, we ourselves shall receive from other peoples and other races some large spiritual contribution for the building up of our own lives and the purging of our western civilization? And if it is so, it seems axiomatic that it is futile for us to attempt to impose a purely western Christ upon peoples who will ultimately perhaps teach us as much of Christ and Christianity as they are ever likely to learn from our imperfect apprehension of divine things. May it not indeed be that by the very vastness of this call that comes to us from the world to-day, God is trying to teach us what a small part of his great Catholic Church we really are and how we ought not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, and that we should not be quite so confident in the future as we seem to have been in the past that we ourselves have already been led into *all* the truth, but that rather we should simply, honestly, quietly, and humbly give to all the world what small contribution we have to give in the interpretation of a Christ who is the property of the whole world and is the consummation of all honest thought and endeavour of all good men in all the world throughout all ages, and that we should bear our witness to a world salvation that we shall never fully comprehend until all the world has had its chance of sharing in it? If the Holy Spirit is to lead us into all truth, it will surely only be when His illumination of all minds all over the world throughout the ages is made available for all men. It was St. Paul, the missionary, weighed down with the petty cares of all the little Churches for whose origin he was, under God, responsible, who, when he tried to think of Christ, could only think of Him in terms of

the whole cosmos. It may be that in the call that is coming from the whole world to the Church to-day we shall indicate our response to that call by forgetting much that is personal and local and insular in our churchmanship. We shall cease much of the criticism of one another within our own communion and shall cease criticizing other humble followers of Christ who show the fruits of His Spirit outside of our communion and shall pray the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory that He may give unto us the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Himself, and that the eyes of our understanding may be enlightened that we may know what is the hope of His calling and what the riches *of the glory of His inheritance in the saints*, and what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward *who believe*, according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under His feet and